

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXII.—OCTOBER, 1907.—No. 128.

THE FRENCH CLERGY DURING THE REIGN OF TERROR.

OUR American readers are aware that a few months ago, in May, 1906, Pope Pius X. raised to the altars of the Church a group of Carmelite nuns who, on July 17, 1795, were beheaded in Paris by order of the revolutionary government. A brief account of these holy women, who met their fate with a simple and cheerful courage that is inexpressibly touching, appeared a few months ago in the pages of the *QUARTERLY REVIEW*. The Carmelites of Compiègne were condemned to death as "fanatics," a term that, in the revolutionary language of the day, meant that they had remained faithful to the religious practices to which in happier days they had bound themselves by a solemn promise. Their beatification, besides being of special interest on account of the dramatic circumstances that accompanied their sacrifice, had a graver import, inasmuch as it distinctly proclaimed the fact that the French Revolution was not merely a social upheaval, but a religious persecution, when men and women perished for their faith.

Although hundreds of royalist prisoners suffered with a Christian courage that we cannot but reverence, they are not, in a literal sense of the word, martyrs, but simply victims of certain social conditions. The case is altogether different, both as regards the nuns who, like the Carmelites, were executed because they were faithful to their religious vows, and the priests who perished in consequence of their uncompromising rejection of a schismatical oath. The "cause" of these last, to use a technical expression, has lately been brought forward before the Roman tribunals, and there seems every reason

to believe that ere long a new group of beatified martyrs belonging to the epoch of the Revolution will be publicly honored.

The French priests who suffered for the faith during the Reign of Terror, as the years 1792, '93, '94, '95 have justly been called, may be divided into several classes. There are those who, rather than take the oath, left their country and accepted a life of exile, poverty and peril in foreign lands; many of these venerable confessors did good work for God in the countries where they found a refuge, and more than one English mission now flourishing owes its foundation to an "emigré" priest from Normandy or Brittany. Then there are those who, having declined to take the oath, nevertheless remained in France, being unwilling to desert their flock. Several hundreds of these devoted confessors were ruthlessly murdered in the Paris prisons on September 2, 1792; others perished on the scaffold during the bloody years that followed; others, again, were imprisoned on board ship off the little island of Aix and there died by inches of hunger and misery.

As a rule, the French clergy came out of the ordeal nobly, a fact that has its significance when we remember that during the eighteenth century vocations to the priesthood were occasionally prompted by policy or convenience. Fidelity to God's grace, combined with the ennobling influence of adversity, did its work, and even commonplace characters rose to a marvelous pitch of heroism when called upon to choose between martyrdom and apostasy.

In the present sketch we purpose to tell the story of two groups of these confessors of the faith—those who were brutally murdered in the prisons of Paris in September, 1792, and those whose more lingering agony was spent on floating prisons off L'île d'Aix.

At the present moment the story of the martyrs of the French Revolution has a peculiar significance. The French priests of the twentieth century are going through a trial of unusual severity, and the example of their predecessors cannot but be beneficial to men who have to face poverty and persecution in the present and possibly trials even heavier in the future. Moreover, it seems probable that ere long the martyred priests of 1792, whose "cause" is pendant at the present moment before the ecclesiastical tribunals, will be raised to the altars of the Church, and if only for this reason, a brief account of the future "beati" must appeal to the faithful children of the Catholic Church throughout the world.

Almost from the outset the policy of the government that in 1789 assumed the direction of affairs in France was distinctly irreligious in its tendencies. The well-meaning, but weak-minded King, Louis XVI., was unfit to cope with the advanced party, whose power soon became overwhelming; but who knows whether even the clear intel-

lect and strong will of Louis XIV., his magnificent ancestor, could have withstood a movement that was the logical result of many complex and long standing causes?

In 1790 the government passed a law that abolished monastic vows. The following year it ordered the confiscation of the property belonging to religious men and women throughout the kingdom. About the same time it caused a scheme to be drawn up known as the "Constitution civile du clergé," the ultimate object of which was to create a schism between the French clergy and Rome. The "Constitution civile" denied the Pope's right to confer spiritual jurisdiction upon the Bishops, and it obliged any priest holding an official position to take an oath of fidelity to "the nation, the law, the King and the Constitution."

The French Bishops, most of whom instinctively rejected the oath, appealed to the Holy See for a decision that would enable them to shape their course with unerring certainty, and in answer to their appeal a brief was issued, dated March 10, 1791, where Pope Pius VI. emphatically declared the "Constitution civile du clergé" to be "sacrilegious and schismatical," and commanded the priests who, through ignorance or through weakness, had consented to accept it, to retract their adhesion without delay, under pain of excommunication.

Thus the question was once for all definitely solved, and the Bishops and priests of France had but one course open to them if they wished to remain in communion with Rome—an uncompromising rejection of the oath, whatever might be the costs.

The determined action of the Pope and the courageous attitude taken up by the clergy seemed to exasperate the government, and during the summer of 1792 it decreed that the priests who declined to take the oath should not only, as they had been so far, deprived of their posts, but immediately imprisoned.

In consequence the prisons of Paris were, during the month of August of that fatal year 1792, filled with hundreds of priests, among whom were several Bishops, many religious, superiors of ecclesiastical seminaries, "curés" and "vicaires," young seminarists and old men, whose life of active labor had long since been brought to a close by age and infirmity.

In some prisons, for instance, at "La Force" and "l'Abbaye," the company was not purely clerical; together with a large number of ecclesiastics were officers of the King's Swiss Guard, magistrates, lawyers, courtiers and even ladies who had belonged to the Queen's household, but at "les Carmes," with one solitary exception, all the prisoners were priests.

The government, after filling the prisons to overflowing, appeared

somewhat at a loss how to dispose of its pensioners. The "guillotine," which some months later was to be permanently erected on the Paris "places," had not as yet made its appearance, and there seems to have been a vague idea of condemning the captives to exile; but gradually the plan of a wholesale massacre grew up in the minds of the men in power. The history of the Revolution has been of late years thoroughly sifted, and it has been ascertained in consequence that the massacres of the month of September, 1792, were not the result of a popular outbreak, but the natural sequence of a carefully prepared design. A writer, M. Lenotre, who has made this fraction of history the object of his special study, seems to have solved the problem. Although the written order is not forthcoming, he has gathered sufficient evidence to prove that the massacres were prepared and commanded by the "Commune," or Municipal Council of Paris, and hypocritically countenanced by the government. The minds of the people were gradually prepared and worked up to a

state of excitement bordering on frenzy. They were informed that not only were the frontiers of the country threatened by the allied armies which the "émigrés" had joined, but also that a graver peril menaced them from within.

The seizure of Longwy by the Prussians was made use of by Danton, the chief promoter of the massacres of September, to serve his purpose. He ably played upon the alarm created by the prospect of a foreign invasion, and in a fiery proclamation he informed the inhabitants of Paris that before marching against the Prussians they must begin by destroying the enemies who, within their walls, were working to enslave the country. All those who have had occasion to realize how easily moved to terror are the ignorant and uncultivated will understand that from its very vagueness Danton's sensational proclamation was all the more calculated to impress the mass of the people. The existence of a vast conspiracy, organized by the "aristocrates" and by the "piêtres réfractaires," as the faithful priests were called, was openly hinted at in the newspapers, and in order to complete this impression of terror the gates of the city were closed and extraordinary measures were taken, apparently to ensure the safety of the citizens.

While the people were gradually working up to the required point, the organizers of the massacres quietly recruited men who for six francs were willing to undertake the bloody work. Large pits were secretly dug in some of the outlying cemeteries to receive the bodies. Maillard, the chief actor in the drama, was instructed to provide his helpers with cudgels and to have plenty of vinegar at hand to wash the blood-stained ground.

At last all was ready. The inhabitants of the city were terrified by hints of a deadly but ill-defined peril, and even the best among them were sufficiently impressed to lose all sense of justice. Hence the indifference with which peaceable "bourgeois" witnessed scenes of blood which, had they been in their sober senses, would have roused their disgust and indignation. Upon others extreme fear acted as an incentive to crime; it lead them to join in the murder of prisoners who were, they had been told, the movers of a "vast conspiracy" that was to reduce France to slavery.

Secure, then, in the active coöperation of some citizens, in the indifference of others, Danton and his colleagues deemed that the time for carrying out their plan had come. On the 2d of September, at midday, a cannon was fired from the Pont-Neuf, a large black flag was hoisted on the Hotel de Ville, the alarm bells rang from the church steeples and within the crowded prisons the priests prepared for death.

One of these prisons still exists, almost unchanged since that fatal day. In the rue de Vangirard, beyond the palace of the Luxembourg, on the left bank of the Seine, stands a large gray building with an Italian looking church. This, before the Revolution, was a convent of Carmelite monks, who built the church in 1620 and who occupied the adjoining monastery till 1792, when their property was confiscated and their community broken up by order of the government.

The empty monastery then became a prison, and early in August that same year over a hundred priests were confined in the church, where no preparation had been made to receive them. When their pitiable condition became known the faithful Catholics who lived in the neighborhood hastened to send them beds, mattresses, coverings and to provide food for those whose means did not permit them to buy provisions, for the revolutionary government declined to feed its prisoners.

In spite of the discomfort of their surroundings, over one hundred men being huddled together in an ordinary sized church during the sultry August days, the confessors of the faith never failed in patience and courage, and the story of their life in prison during those weary weeks of waiting reads like an episode of the early Church.

At first they were forbidden to leave the building, but in consequence of the great heat the air within became almost unbearable, and the doctors having remonstrated with the authorities, they were allowed twice a day to walk in the adjoining garden.

From the outset they adopted a rule of life in common. Every hour of the day had its occupation; the office books passed from one

group of priests to another; prayer, meditation and conversations, of which the favorite theme was the glory and happiness of martyrdom, filled up their time. The very few priests who survived the 2d of September are unanimous in describing the peace and superhuman cheerfulness of these men who were living in the shadow of death. Among them were representatives of almost every diocese in France—eleven vicars general, twelve “curés,” eleven ex-Jesuits, eight other religious, thirteen Sulpicians, professors, chaplains, young seminarists, sturdy parish priests from Normandy and the northern provinces whose lives had been spent in the quiet sphere of their country parishes; others from the south, who brought into the motley assembly the brightness of their sunny temperament. At the head of the chosen band were one Archbishop and two Bishops, men of illustrious birth, who to the courtesy of the “old régime” united the truly apostolic spirit of pastors of souls. The Archbishop, Jean Marie du Lau, had been appointed in 1775 to the See of Arles. He refused to seek safety in flight, and when his friends urged him to leave France he replied: “We must die at our post.” On account of his superior rank and infirm health his fellow-prisoners were eager to surround him with every attention in their power, but he declined to accept even a mattress for his own use until every priest in the church was provided for, and through long weeks of uncertainty and suspense his calmness, quiet dignity and unruffled patience supported his companions. The Bishops of Saintes and Beauvais were brothers, belonging to the noble house of La Rochefaucauld. The elder, Francois Joseph, Bishop of Beauvais, seems to have been of a gentle and lovable disposition, but sternly resolute when his principles were at stake. He had from the outset opposed the “Constitution civile du clergé” and done his best to infuse his own spirit into his clergy. His brother, the Bishop of Saintes, was a man in the prime of life, whose chief characteristics were his intense devotion to his elder brother and his cordial kindness to his fellow-sufferers. He was a voluntary prisoner, having refused to be parted from the Bishop of Beauvais when the latter was arrested. “I have always been intimately united to my brother,” he said, “and cannot let him go to prison without me.”

As time went on, the reports that were brought to the prisoners of the anarchy that reigned outside made them realize still more clearly the fate that awaited them, but their cheerfulness was not impaired. The Abbé Fronteau, one of those who finally escaped, says that he does not remember a single instance of regret or discontent. The same witness adds that as the danger became more pressing, “each one begged for the grace of God, renewed the sacrifice of his life and continued his usual exercises in peace.”

Their untroubled calmness came solely from their absolute resignation to the will of God, for they had by this time no doubt as to the fate that awaited them. So convinced, indeed, were the three Bishops that the end was drawing near that they commissioned their servants, who called every day to receive their orders, to settle their outstanding debts, so that none should suffer by their death.

On Sunday, September 2, Mgr. du Lau presided at meals, as usual, with his accustomed gentle dignity, and towards 4 o'clock the prisoners were turned into the garden for their daily walk; but one and all felt that momentous events were at hand. From the outside came the sound of the "*Marseillaise*;" men were hurrying to and fro, the church bells were tolling and over the excited, throbbing, terror-stricken city hung the awful menace of a mysterious peril.

Suddenly the quiet garden was invaded by the paid assassins. The Archbishop of Arles was standing close to his vicar general, who afterwards escaped. "I believe they are coming to kill us," the latter exclaimed. "Well, *mon cher*," was the prelate's quiet answer, "if our time has come, let us thank God for allowing us to die for so good a cause." A few seconds later the Archbishop was literally hacked to pieces under the eyes of his companion. The Bishop of Beauvais, who was kneeling before a little shrine at the extremity of the enclosure, was disabled from a gun wound. Other priests fell here and there mortally wounded till the voice of Maillard, the organizer of the massacres, interrupted the man-hunt, in which his subordinates were taking a fiendish pleasure. "This is not the right way to work," he said, and the surviving priests were ordered back to the church, where they took up their station between the communion rails and the altar, the Bishop of Beauvais lying on a mattress on the ground, his devoted brother by his side.

In a tiny passage that still exists leading from the church into the garden, Maillard instituted a kind of mock tribunal, and when these preparations were completed, the priests were ordered to come out two together as their names were called out. They then passed before Maillard or his deputy, Violette, and were offered life and liberty if they would take the schismatical oath. This they one and all declined to do. In consequence they were hurried down a double stone staircase that leads into the garden and made over to the blood-thirsty ruffians, who, armed with swords and cudgels, stood waiting for their prey!

The savage shrieks of the assassins were distinctly heard by the survivors, whose ranks were thinning rapidly. They knelt round the altar; not a murmur passed their lips, only the whispered sounds of the prayers for the dying and dead were heard within the church. When "*Pierre Louis de la Rochefoucauld*" was summoned the Bishop

of Saintes promptly rose from his knees, affectionately embraced his brother, who lay helpless, and, his lips moving in prayer, passed on to his doom. Then came the turn of a "vicaire" of St. Roch, the Abbé Guilleminet, by whose side knelt his intimate friend, an officer, the only layman present. Like the Bishop of Saintes, Count Régis de Valfouds was a voluntary victim. He had accompanied his friend to prison and had steadily refused to escape when, a few days before the massacre, he was secretly informed that not being a priest, he might, if he choose, avoid the fate that awaited his companions. Closely united in life, the priest and the soldier went to meet death side by side. The "abbé" was reciting his office and his friend held a volume of the Holy Scriptures.

One of the last to be summoned was the Bishop of Beauvais. Hearing his name called out, he said: "I am quite willing to die, but, 'messieurs,' I cannot walk or stand. Will you therefore have the kindness to carry me?" And, strangely enough, the soldiers in answer to his courteous speech, lifted him almost tenderly in their arms and handed him over to the bloody ruffians, who in the space of two hours dispatched over one hundred victims.

After lying on the ground for a whole night many of the dead bodies were carried to the cemetery of Vangirard, where they were hastily buried in a large pit. Others were thrown into a well in the garden itself, where they were discovered in 1867. After a minute and careful examination, conducted by an eminent surgeon, it was ascertained that the skulls and bones, so unexpectedly brought to light, bore the marks of violent blows sufficient to cause death. Another curious testimony confirmed the fact that these remains belonged to the martyred priests. There was some difficulty in finding the exact place of the well, in which, according to a long established tradition, the bodies of many of the victims had been thrown. After a long and fruitless search the disheartened workmen were about to retire, when an old man made his way into the garden. Taking one of the workmen by the arm, he led him to a certain spot that had hitherto escaped notice. "They are there," he whispered, and, having refused to give his name, he hurriedly left the place. The search was immediately resumed, and this time was successful.

What haunting memories of a guilty past the sight of the quiet enclosure may have raised in the mind of one who perchance belonged to Maillard's band of "travailleurs," as they styled themselves!

Almost by miracle a few priests contrived to escape. Some scaled the walls, others were, strangely enough, saved by the lookers on. It is to these that we owe the account of the faithfulness with which,

one and all, the confessors declined to take the schismatical oath and preferred death to apostasy. Among those who were saved almost miraculously was M. de la Pannonie, the vicar general of Arles, who was standing by Mgr. du Lau when the latter fell mortally wounded. He afterwards made his way to England, where he gave Abbé Barruel, the first historian of the martyred priests, much valuable information.

There are few spots in Paris more impressive than "les Carmes." In spite of the changes wrought by time in other places, this remote corner of old Paris is comparatively untouched. The church where the prisoners prepared for death, the narrow passage where they confessed their faith, the stone staircase down which they were hurled, the garden that was drenched with their blood, all these are unchanged and the twentieth century pilgrim finds himself face to face with the memories of a tragic past among unaltered surroundings.

In a crypt beneath the church are kept the skulls and bones that were found in the well and also the blood-stained pavement of a little oratory, now destroyed, but where several confessors, the Bishop of Beauvais among others, were wounded during the first scene in the drama.

Although the building and garden of "les Carmes" are more especially connected with the martyrs of 1792, one hundred and fourteen of whom reaped the palm of victory within its precincts, the process of beatification that has been lately started likewise includes the priests who on that same day were butchered in other prisons of Paris.

Seventy-five of these confessors, among whom were many Lazarists, ex-Jesuits and Capuchins, were murdered at the Seminary St. Firmin, that was used as a prison; twenty-six others perished at "L'Abbaye" and a few at "La Force." Like their brethren at "les Carmes," they proved themselves steadfast in their refusal to take the oath, submissive and resigned in presence of a hideous death.

We are told that at "L'Abbaye" over sixty priests were confined in a large room that was part of the great Abbey of St. Germain des près, of which only the church now remains. Suddenly the voice of the jailer was heard through the closed door: "The abbey is invaded by the people; the priests are being murdered!"

Instinctively the captives threw themselves on their knees. The "curé" of St. Jean en Grève, one of the parishes of Paris, alone remained standing. He was a white-haired old man, bent under the weight of years. With extended hands he gave his companions a last absolution. Then, with a strong voice, he began the prayers for the dying and the words, "Depart thou, Christian soul," echoed

solemnly through the crowded room, where men full of life and strength were waiting for the end!

However cruel, humanly speaking, was the fate of the priests who on the 2d of September, 1792, were literally hacked to pieces in the Paris prisons, their sufferings were comparatively short. After a brief period of imprisonment came a sharp struggle, crowned by a martyr's death. A more lingering agony awaited those who, having declined to take the schismatical oath, were condemned to imprisonment on board the ships laying at anchor off Rochefort, close to the little island of Aix, that, out of reverence for these holy confessors, might fitly be called "the Isle of Saints." In a narrow space several hundred priests were packed together during one year and more. They were deprived of their books of devotion, forbidden to pray aloud, separated from the outer world by the sea that surrounded their floating prison. The ships on board which they were confined had formerly been used for the slave trade. The cabins were narrow, and the foul air at night was even harder to bear than the cold and wet of the open decks during the day. One of the survivors, M. Labiche de Reignefort, belonging to the Diocese of Limoges, has vividly described the life that he and his companions led on board the vessel called "les deux Associés." They had already spent several painful months in the prison of Rochefort, but their worst sufferings began when in the spring of 1794 they were removed on board ship.

On reaching the vessel they were robbed of their money, watches, knives and extra clothing. A Capuchin monk who had concealed a crucifix among his belongings afforded his jailers a subject of hideous mirth. The crucifix was reviled and insulted, and finally the head was cut off by one of the officers present.

At night four hundred prisoners were packed into a narrow space under the deck, where barely forty persons might have been lodged in comfort. The couches were so close together that the sleepers disturbed each other at every turn, and though the ceiling was very low, several rows of wooden boards were placed one above the other to serve as beds.

The darkness, heat, stench, foulness and vermin of this horrible place were such that a medical man from Rochefort who came to inspect the ship exclaimed: "If four hundred dogs were shut up here even for one night, they would either die or go mad."

At the end of a few weeks every species of disease broke out among the prisoners, over a hundred of whom died in the space of three months. Scurvy and erysipelas were of common occurrence. It often happened that during the night more than one prisoner died simply from want of air, and when once the cabin door was closed

and locked no power on earth would induce the jailers to open it before the following morning. A priest of good birth and great holiness, M. de Montjourieal, was attacked by a malady named "pediculaire," the result of his filthy surroundings. Vermin bred under his skin, and in consequence he was separated from his fellow-sufferers. He bore this cruel and humiliating torture with extraordinary patience and died peacefully in the wretched hut where he lived alone.

The sufferings that the priests endured during the day were scarcely less painful than their misery at night. They were left on deck from 7 in the morning till nightfall, exposed to the sun, rain or wind, as the case might be, with no shelter and, worse still, no occupation. Their office books had been taken from them, but some of them succeeded in saving a few tattered pages of their Breviaries, and these poor remnants they treasured as though they had been "pearls and diamonds" of great price. Their jailers employed them to sweep, wash and clean the decks and cabins. Even the old and sick were forced to work, while their hard taskmasters continued to insult and abuse them.

The food was not only bad, it was dealt out in such small quantities that some priests seem to have gone mad from hunger. Being so closely packed together day and night, it became almost impossible to undress, and as they had no change of clothes, the unfortunate prisoners' wretched garments by degrees fell to pieces.

The slightest remark or criticism, or, worse still, any attempt to procure extra food, was severely punished. Once seventeen priests were put in irons because, with the captain's permission, they had drawn up a petition to the civil authorities at Rochefort. Another was condemned to the same punishment for a fortnight because he begged some fruit from a sailor. A priest named Roulhac, having jokingly remarked that a hundred resolute men might easily take possession of the ship, was immediately shot. The captain, whose fiendish cruelty towards his prisoners made him seize every opportunity of adding to their sufferings, often reminded them that those who ventured to perform any external act of worship should have the same fate.

In some respects these weary months of squalid misery, humiliation and want were harder to bear than the short, sharp trial that the martyrs at "des Carmes" had to face, but the confessors whose story we are telling bore the ordeal bravely. Many were released by death. When their condition became desperate they were removed from the ship into small boats that were used as hospitals, and where some of their brethern who volunteered to act as infirmarians attended upon them as best they could. It was impossible to

obtain the necessary remedies or even to screen the dying priests from the sun or protect them from the rain, and the only service their companions were able to render them was to speak to them of the home to which they were hurrying and to speed them on their heavenward journey. Some of the prisoners had concealed about their persons a vial of holy oils and were thus able to give their dying brethren the Sacrament of Extreme Unction; but these cases were extremely rare; the sailors acted as spies, and in order to curry favor with their chiefs, were ready on every occasion to denounce the unfortunate captives.

The doctors who occasionally came from Rochefort to inspect the sanitary condition of the ships performed their mission as hastily as possible, their one thought being to escape from the foul atmosphere. We may imagine how gladly, under such conditions, the confessors who were attacked by illness hailed the approach of their deliverer—death. Altogether about six hundred priests perished in the course of a year, some in the open boats, others in a so-called hospital on "L'île Madame," a tiny islet at the mouth of the river Charente, where a few tents had been hastily erected.

The account given by our author of the last moments of these holy men is inexpressibly touching. Nothing, he says, could equal the gentleness, resignation and sweet patience with which they endured the neglect and discomfort of their surroundings. There were among them priests of all rank and age—venerable canons whose lives had been spent in the dignified seclusion of some quiet cathedral town, parish priests accustomed to the fresh air and active life of their country villages, religious of different orders, men of gentle birth and refined habits, to whom the loathsomeness of their prison must have been trying beyond words. One and all faced their weary martyrdom with unflinching heroism.

Among those who died in the boats was a Capuchin monk, Father Sebastian, who was looked on as a saint by his companions. He breathed his last on his knees with clasped hands. M. Pertinaud de Jourgnac, vicar general of the Diocese of Limoges, continued, although he was himself seriously ill, to assist and console his neighbors. One of the priests had made a rough cross with two bits of wood, and this M. de Jourgnac held before the dying confessors. At last his own strength failed and he lay down by their side; but even then he continued to exhort and encourage them, till at last he was heard to murmur, "In pace in idipsum, dormiam et requiescam," and his happy soul winged its flight to heaven. A priest who was present and who gave M. de Labiche de Reigneftort an account of this holy death, added: "Never can I thank God sufficiently for having permitted me to witness the end of a saint."

At first the dead bodies were thrown into the sea, but in many cases the current brought them back to land and the inhabitants of the coasts having complained of the danger caused by the presence of so many decomposed corpses, it was decided that they should be buried on the island of Aix. This small islet lies near the larger islands of Ré and Oleron. It is now holy ground, and there is a plan afloat of raising a church on its hallowed soil in memory of the confessors of the faith who were there laid to rest.

Their burial was conducted with an utter lack of respect or even decency. M. de Reignefort tells us that when a priest died in the boats his remains were promptly removed and a certain number of his companions were told off to carry them to the island. This was no easy task. In many cases, horrible to relate, the bodies were decomposed before death, and the survivors had the utmost difficulty in conveying them safely to their place of burial. Often they had to wade knee deep through the water before reaching the sandy beach that served as a cemetery. When, as frequently happened, **three or four** priests died the same day, their companions went to and fro, often without food, for hours together.

It was when engaged on this painful task that the prisoners first heard of the fall of Robespierre, an event that promised better days. It was at the end of July, and they were on their way to the ile d'Aix to bury the dead when one of the soldiers who were appointed to guard them whispered: "Keep up your courage; your fate may change any day. Robespierre has been guillotined."

Some months passed by, however, before the surviving priests were restored to freedom. At the end of October, 1794, out of nine hundred prisoners only two hundred and seventy-four were still alive. The others lay at rest in the "ile d'Aix" or in the "ile Madame!" Want, hunger, foul air and ill use had done the work of extermination almost as rapidly as the guillotine.

During the winter of 1795 the sufferings of the survivors were intense. The weather was extraordinarily severe and they were left the whole day on the open decks, exposed to the wind and rain, often drenched to the bone, with no possibility either of changing their clothes or warming their benumbed limbs. Many of them fell into a state of stupor from excess of suffering and, says M. de Reignefort, it seemed as if isolation and misery had robbed them of their faculties.

As time went on, however, they realized that their rough jailers' demeanor was becoming less inhuman, and from this they rightly concluded that the change brought about by the fall of Robespierre was at last producing some effect on the policy of the government. One day they were, to their amazement and joy, given two office books and permitted to pray in common. No material benefit could

have afforded them greater consolation, and their spirits, crushed by suffering, revived when they resumed the pious habits of the past. One or two priests were appointed to read the psalms aloud, the others joined in, and towards evening the sound of the "Ave Maris Stella" and other hymns was wafted across the sea from one prison boat to another. Surely these hymns of praise and pleading that rose from the little band of martyred priests must have ascended straight to the throne of God!

At last, on February 2, 1795, the captives were informed that orders had been received from Paris to convey them to the town of Saintes, on the mainland; but some days elapsed before their removal could be carried out. Several towns on the coast where they were appointed to land refused to receive them. The state of misery, sickness and filth to which they were reduced seems to have inspired repugnance and alarm. In the end the little band of prisoners, about two hundred in number, landed on a lonely spot on the banks of the Charente. Some rough country carts were provided for those who could not walk; the others plodded as best they could through the mud and rain to a large village, where they were shut up for the night in a desecrated church.

One of the priests, M. Michel, tells us that although the sky was dark and dismal, the rain falling heavily, in spite of fatigue and hunger, these first hours of comparative liberty seemed exquisitely delightful. The priests were still prisoners, but the sense of space, after the horrible confinement of their floating prison, made them feel almost free. The next day, February 8, they arrived at Saintes. They presented a pitiable picture. Clad in rags, unkempt, dirty, weakened by long suffering and in many cases, says M. de Labiche de Reigneftort, too much crushed by all they had undergone to be in full possession of their faculties, the confessors made their entrance into the little city, where their arrival was eagerly expected. The conduct of its inhabitants affords a bright example of generosity. They flocked to meet the prisoners, many burst into tears at the sight of the miserable procession, but one and all were eager to help and to relieve. By orders of the authorities the new arrivals were lodged in an old convent and the citizens were "in the name of humanity" permitted to assist them. "Hardly had we arrived," says our informant, "when crowds of men and women of all rank invaded the house, bringing us linen, clothes, furniture, money and eatables." The sick were put to bed and tended by a doctor, who cared for them "as if they were his relations or his intimate friends." "In fact," adds M. de Reigneftort, "the reception we met with at Saintes would have made up for all we had previously suffered had we not founded our hope and consolation on higher motives."

Many of the released prisoners never recovered from the sufferings they had undergone and died soon after their deliverance. The others who, after an interval of rest, were able to resume their priestly occupations, bore to their dying day the marks of their severe trials on board ship. A letter that lies before us as we write these lines tells us how these venerable confessors, on whose brow suffering had set its seal, lived and died in odor of sanctity. They were, as a rule, singularly guarded and reticent on the subject of their past sufferings and adhered with scrupulous fidelity to the resolutions that they had made when on board their prison house. These resolutions, which were drawn up by the captive priests almost immediately after their removal to the ship "*les deux Associés*," have been handed down to us by one of their number, M. de Reignefort, whose valuable testimony we have so often quoted.

The "Resolutions" are divided under several heads. They were adopted by all the priests with earnest good will and kept with a faithfulness that speaks volumes for their spiritual perfection. These holy confessors thought that their priesthood obliged them to practice a renunciation more delicate and complete than the patience demanded of ordinary Christians. Hence their scrupulous anxiety to avoid the merest shadow of self-seeking. They bound themselves during their imprisonment to relinquish the hope of being set free, and in order to avoid all occasions of spiritual unrest, to avoid asking for news of what might be going on outside their prison. All their thoughts and feelings were to be concentrated on the acceptance of God's holy will. They were to live cordially and affectionately united, eager to help one another and with the one object of serving God by patience and mutual charity. In the event of their being one day set free, they promised to refrain from exaggerated demonstrations of joy and also to avoid over-eagerness in the recovery of their lawful belongings—books, property, money, etc. They also bound themselves to avoid bitterness or vainglory if obliged to speak of their past trials; never to discuss the faults or weaknesses of their fellow-sufferers; in fact, to keep silence as far as possible on the terrible ordeal of their lives on board the slave ships.

So faithfully, indeed, did they observe these resolutions, that the story we have just related is comparatively little known even in France. This is owing in a great measure to the humble and scrupulous reticence with which the surviving priests avoided the subject of their sufferings. Happily, M. de Labiche de Reignefort deemed it his duty to tell the harrowing tale; but he did so with a charity and a humility that prove him to have been a worthy member of the heroic band.

Within the last few years the exertions of a devoted "*curé*," M.

l'Abbé Mauseau, whose life is spent within sight of "L'île d'Aix," have brought to light much unpublished information on the subject, and the researches that have been lately set on foot with a view to the beatification of the martyred confessors have revived the half-forgotten memories of their passion and death. At a moment when the French priests of the twentieth century have to face persecution, the example of the martyrs of 1792 has a peculiar significance, for although their methods are different, the politicians of 1907 are inspired by the same spirit as those of 1792. Under present circumstances the memories that linger round the gray walls of "des Carmes" or the lonely islet of Aix are fraught with meaning; they bring home to the harassed French clergy lessons of endurance, fidelity and devotion that will surely help them to "fight the good fight" under different and less painful conditions, but with the same brave cheerfulness as their glorious predecessors.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

Paris, France.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TO THE ART OF MUSIC.

AMONG modern writers on music the less learned, but more pretentious, look with something akin to disdainful compassion at the efforts made by mediæval church musicians to discover the laws that governed music and to turn them to practical use. It is nearly always overlooked by such writers that time—time that covers the rise and decay of generations—is necessary for the development of an art, and that one of the greatest means (if not the only one) to attain success is by a painfully slow process of experiment. Were this experimenting, or groping as it is contemptuously called when applied to the work of the mediævalists, found to end in failure there would be sufficient reason to find fault. Fortunately, success is so evident that one must admit that our modern art of music is entirely based on their labor and toil. Many seem to forget that there is just as much groping to-day in the field of electricity—to take but one example—as there was in that of music during, say, the eleventh century.

It is an easy matter to criticize the early workers in music; to see their faults and suggest how they could have improved their methods. But were we placed in the same position, surrounded by the same difficulties and handicapped to the same degree that they

were, yet at the same time bringing into play the opinions and standards of taste of the twentieth century, the results for art would be a dreary blank.

Nowadays there is neither time, taste nor ability (apparently) to produce a real work of art. Simplicity of conception is mocked at; nothing will pass muster that is not a conglomeration of all schools, signalized by a strong admixture of ugliness. The composer, should he seek for immediate success, must jumble together all possible sounds, discordant as well as concordant; must press into his service every instrument he can think of. And we know what the result is of all this vulgarity. Stupid paintings of mere mechanics are exhibited and lauded to the skies by a coterie of personal friends or by dealers who in one way or another possess influence. If a canvas be made to sell at a "white sale" the name of the workman who turned out the daub is made, and he is ranked (for the time being) among artists. The musical monstrosities have even a larger circle to inflict punishment on. Most of us recall with feelings of awe the cacophony of which accident or necessity made us unwilling listeners.

Mediæval artists and musicians appeared to have been in touch with the ideas and sentiments of the people. They were not searching after transcendental effects (a modern catchcry meaning nothing), but kept to simplicity and unity of idea, and thus produced works of art. Still this simplicity of purpose was probably one of the great causes why so many abuses crept into church music. The principle was stretched so far that the popular specimens of peoples and the correspondingly low order of verse to which they were sometimes allied were pressed into the service of the Church, not with any idea of contempt for religion, but through something like a want of recollection or foresight of the abuses that could possibly crop up from such introduction. It was merely going too far with the practice the Catholic Church has ever had of turning to the use of religion everything that could possibly be utilized of the peoples and races among whom the faith has been planted. With most of the mediæval musicians true religious feelings guided them in their work, and the compositions they left after them bear marks of an earnest endeavor to make the most of the means at their disposal. Exceptions may possibly leap up in the memory. But it would be unfair to apply like criteria of perfection to the works of all those who devoted themselves to music. Some minds were warped by the continual struggle against the canons of art then accepted; others were striving after effects previously unheard of; others, again, had not perhaps the touch of genius.

During all the centuries, from the fifth onwards, the monastic

orders were devoting their energies to the spreading of knowledge—the classics, the arts and sciences. Music in particular occupied a great part of their daily lives. The Divine Office, with its psalmody and hymnody, was chanted in choir at different portions of the day, and there were the various festivals with their proper chants for the Mass when a veritable feast of church song was given. Such continual practice of singing could not but have a far-reaching effect on the art of music. But the want of a clear, ready notation that would make easy the task of learning the chants not only prevented any material advance in the art, but caused the religious to fall back on a merely traditional method of teaching, and was, moreover, I believe, one of the great reasons why we find no clear references by mediæval writers to minute particulars about singing. It had, besides, one great danger attached to it—the corruption of the chants through a defective memorizing of them. For any one who has a knowledge of folk-music (to which church song is in some ways similar) is aware that where melodies of a people are transferred from one to another by memory only, as most are, the varieties of ways in which a melody can be played or sung is very great and a defective memorizing gives rise to many corrupt versions. It was a similar case with the chants of the Church up to the Middle Ages. A considerable store of chant had come down from time immemorial, and from sources unknown. Living traditions of how it was to be sung were in existence; its melodies were treasured in the memories of those whose duty it was to teach their brethren the song of the Breviary and the Missal. We can almost construct a programme of their labors—the laws that governed the blending of one or more voices had to be discovered; an easy and an accurate system of notation had to be worked out; the best and purest version of the chants had to be sought for and adopted.

But this meant work of a not at all easy kind, and it is the constant application to it that we may attribute the preservation of European music. Without the labors of the monks music could scarcely have made the slightest advance, if we consider the continual disturbed state of the nations. The monastic orders were like members of a great family with kindred in every corner of the civilized world, all in touch with each other in one way or another; all having the same end in view; all thirsting for knowledge; all exchanging with each other what was known of the sciences and arts, and handing on to succeeding generations the results of their labors, the doctrines of their greatest teachers and the works of their most learned and skilled men.

The first attempts at notation were nothing more than setting down a series of mnemonics by choirmasters to enable them to

remember the exact melodic figures, the rise and fall of the chant on the different syllables of the text, just as Blessed Notker Balbulus invented his Sequences to help in recalling the neumes of the Alleluia. Whether this method of keeping the chants in mind was in imitation of the ancient Greek methods or was an original idea on the part of the monks may be questioned. It matters not; for the figures used in the mediæval chant were by far more complex than those of the Greeks. This may be seen by comparing the Greek fragments discovered in recent times—the Hymn to Helios, the Hymn to Nemesis, the Mymn of Delphi—and corresponding mediæval chants.

It is not an easy thing to determine to whom credit is to be given for first suggesting musical notation in Christian times. If we pass over the claims (now recently denied) made for the antiquity of the notation in the *Codex Amiatinus* that was brought by Ceolfrid, abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul's monastery at Jarrow, to Gregory II., about 716, foremost among those who laid the foundations of our modern notation come the monks of St. Gall, in Switzerland. This monastery, founded by an Irishman, contains on its rolls more than one honored name in music. The notation that the monks employed there is known as the Romanian, it being generally acknowledged up to quite recently as the work of a Roman chanter named Romanus. This person, so the story goes, was sent from Rome by Pope Adrian in 789 at the request of Charlemagne. In company with another chanter, one Petrus, they set out for Gaul, where they were to teach the Roman traditions of chant. When they arrived at St. Gall Romanus fell ill and remained at the monastery while Petrus pursued his journey. The system that Romanus either invented, or possibly brought with him from Rome, was a really remarkable one. It embraced symbols to denote the raising and lowering of the voice; marks of rhythm and intensity, with certain letters to modify the various symbols used. He moreover changed the form of some of the neumes. The system, although having good points in its favor, was rather complicated, and good results could only be achieved when it was employed by choirmasters of exceptional ability. We cannot doubt that the monks of St. Gall must have found it a great help, for they made use of it during a long period.

In other places attempts were made to invent divers kinds of notation. St. Odo (died 947) is credited with a system based on the letters of the alphabet. It is thought that he was successful with it, but how far so we know not, as his work is lost. The Antiphonary of Montpellier, discovered by M. Danjou and dating from the eleventh century, contains two kinds of notation—alphabetic (in which the first fifteen letters of the alphabet are used) and neumes.

Then came an attempt to make the neumes more useful by writing them at different heights above the text in order to show the rise and fall of the intervals. A modification of this, involving the use of dots and points, was used in Southern France and the part of Spain adjoining, and hence has been termed the Aquitanian notation. Another invention in the same field that revolutionized the art of music was the introduction by some unknown genius of a single line above the text set to neumes. In this innovation lay the germ from which our perfected modern scale developed. The new departure immediately commended itself to the monks, who saw the possibilities that could arise from it, and no time elapsed before another line was added. This step considerably simplified the chants and made the more perfect rendering of them a comparatively easy thing. In the process of time a further development took place. This was the introduction of the Guidonian system, where to the already existing two lines two more were added.

Meanwhile the development of the one line system was going on in another direction. A staff notation was being tried. This consisted of a number of lines and spaces, the latter alone being used to represent certain notes. In front of the spaces, at the beginning of the stave, the letters T and S were placed, signifying tone and semitone. The syllables of the text were written in the spaces, ascending or descending as the melody demanded, thus giving a means of finding the pitch. To Hucbald, a monk of St. Amand, who died in 932, according to Fétis, the honor of this invention was given. But of late it has been denied him, and with the new school of critics the inventor is nameless. Closely allied with this Hucbaldian stave is one invented by Hermann Contractus (1013-1054), a pupil of the monks of Reichenau. The system of Hermann is much more elaborate than the Hucbaldian, for he used a series of letters both singly and in combination. Like the Romanian it was too complicated to be of any general use, and did not acquire popularity.

While the monks were wrestling with this difficult problem of notation and the means of facilitating the rendition of the chants, they were also working out an elementary system of harmony that finally developed (by slow degrees, it is true) into the system we now have. If the history of the past were accurately known we should most likely find that musicians owe much to many an unhonored name among those who in the quiet of the cloister spent their lives working to get at the secrets of music that lay hidden behind an apparently impenetrable veil; facing and conquering what must have then looked to be appalling difficulties, until they found a method that would be simple, easy and useful. The probability is

very strong that the work of men like Romanus, Hermann, Guido d'Arezzo, Hucbald or St. Odo was but the reflex of equally great ability and knowledge of many humble souls hidden away from the world's gaze in the monasteries. To those great unknown honor should be freely paid by us who have profited by their silent, secret labors.

Those who were endeavoring to formulate laws that governed the combination of sounds were working on virgin soil, which caused the progress to be necessarily slow. Any one who studies those efforts of the monks must express admiration at the deliberate and full, though somewhat tedious, manner in which they prepared their treatises. But in order to avoid falling into a captious critical mood when looking over these early works on harmony, we cannot keep too clearly before us the enormous difficulties then besetting the subject. Who the first was to devote his abilities to *Organum* or Diaphony we know not. The treatises *Musica Enchiriadis* and *Scholia Enchiriadis*, for centuries attributed to Hucbald, but now by Dom Morin to St. Odo, abbot of S. Pons de Tomieres, Provence, contain the earliest scientific attempts at explaining and giving rules for harmony in two, three and four parts. The Hucbaldian treatises are remarkable for the ingenuity with which their author works out the Organum, and for his display of erudition throughout. It seems not at all improbable that the author was applying his scientific knowledge and reducing to rule the methods of part-singing then in vogue in many monasteries. And it is not unreasonable to assume that the writer was urged on by the necessity of formulating rules based on practices observed by his brethren in their magadizing. It appears much nearer the truth to hold that some rough method of harmony was known and practiced long before *Musica Enchiriadis* was written. Of this, however, substantial evidence is wanting, but a few words of Scotus Erigena in his work *De Divisione Naturae* show in a vague way that in his time (circa 840 A. D.) some kind of harmony or blending of the voices was in use. But I think it just as possible to go farther back and interpret the words of Platina concerning Pope Vitalian's supposed introduction of the organ into the Church at Rome, and interpret the words to mean a blending of voices, or what is technically known as *Organum*—which most likely amounted to nothing more at that time than the effect produced by boys and men singing in unison.

The few references and treatises on music that we have are only the salvage of those which existed, but disappeared in the burning and pillaging of many monasteries. Most people have no idea what treasures of learning were destroyed during those troublous times. The greatest vandals and destroyers of all sources of knowledge

were those who wanted to spread the light of the Gospel, as they said, in the sixteenth century. To them it mattered not how great a loss to humanity the destruction of literary and scientific works would be; anything and everything found within the walls of a monastery, the citadel of Poprey, were given to the flames. Considering to what an extent this vandalism went, no one can be surprised at the limited evidences of learning that have come down to us concerning music. But what we have, such as the materials gathered by Gerbert in his *De cantu et musica sacra* and his still more remarkable *Scriptores ecclesiastici*, etc., leaves with us the idea that the labors of the mediæval ecclesiastics in the cause of music were unceasing.

After Hucbald and St. Odo came Guido d'Arezzo. He was a Benedictine, was born about 990, and early became famous as a teacher of music. We can scarcely estimate what Guido did for the art. So far as can be gathered he was so humble and pious that it was by great persuasion only that he could be dragged into publicity to teach his theories. This desire of retirement is the principal cause why his claims to a place of honor in the history of music are so keenly debated. In recent years attempts have been made to strip him of all the honor that writers have paid him for centuries. There is a modicum of truth in the statements of some of his modern adversaries, but the genius of the man is too evident to allow his place in history to have been entirely false. The results of his oral teaching at Pomposa and at Avellana are practically unknown. All our certain knowledge of his work is obtained from his *Micrologus*; from a letter to a Pomposian monk; from another short work entitled *De artificio novi cantus*, and an instruction *De mensura monochordi*. But his abilities were thought so much of that throughout Europe his fame spread far and near. When common gossip becomes the vehicle of knowledge it is a difficult thing to tell where the truth begins and ends. It happened so with the musical reputation of Guido. The enthusiasm of his contemporaries for his talent and virtues so carried them away that the stories they circulated concerning his work caused exaggerated assertions of his abilities to grow apace with the spread of his fame. The inevitable has happened. The tide has turned and endeavors are now being made to strip Guido of every leaf of laurel and relegate him as a pretentious charlatan to oblivion. This mode of treating him can never be accepted by honest historians, for Guido stands apart, a giant born out of time; an exceptionally gifted man, and one who did incalculable good for music.

We shall not be far out if we say that to him we owe the origin of the F and C clefs, the principles on which our stave is based, for

if he did not actually invent the system (and his words seem to show this) he perfected it and made it acceptable to his contemporaries, and, what is of greater value, capable of being used by every one; the use of solmization, an ingenious method of teaching the gamut by the joints of the thumb and fingers (hence called the Guidonian hand); very probably, also, the division of the scale into hexachords, from which sprang the future glory of fugue under the sixteenth century masters. For a pioneer in the field these are works not to be despised.

Coming after him are some remarkable writers on music, all helping to advance the art. However small may have been the additions made to it by some of them, they each and all hold places of honor in history. With the *Ars cantus mensurabilis* of Magister Franco mensurable music may be said to have begun. Who this Franco was has occasioned not a little difference of opinion among historians. But the one now prevailing is that he was Franco of Paris, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who flourished about the middle of the eleventh century, writing his work on mensurable music somewhere about 1060. In history the author has been generally called Franco of Cologne, but there seem to have been two writers of the same name, the work of one being attributed by mistake to the other. There were others, such as Hugh di Vercelli (1212), the Benedictine William of Odington, or of Evesham (circa 1300), John de Muris (circa 1320), Tinctoris, born about 1434; Zarlino (1517-1590), who did considerable good for music by gradually paving the way for modern theorists and composers. But one cannot help comparing their voices to an echo of the living voice of music that was heard in private within the walls of innumerable monasteries.

Walter de Odington by his work *De speculatione musicae* showed himself to be a man of deep culture and a musician of no mean parts. His work on music is of great value for a study of rhythm, derived or based on poetic measures, and it shows the importance attached to this branch of music by his contemporaries. Another Englishman, Simon Tunsted, a Franciscan of Oxford, wrote a treatise on music entitled *De quatuor principalibus*, about 1351, which also is of considerable value for the manner in which it treats of measured music. The Englishman, Hothby, Carmelite and doctor of music, likewise did service for the art by his works, one termed *Ars musica*, another *Calliopea legale*, and two treatises on counterpoint, all of which he wrote at either Ferrara or Florence. Just a century later than Tunsted Tinctoris was born in Brabant, in 1434. He may be said to have covered the entire field of musical knowledge by his many works, among which is the first Dictionary of Music ever published. Zarlino's *Institutioni armoniche*, published in 1558,

with two volumes that could be called appendices, *Dimonstrationi armoniche* (1571) and *Supplimenti musicali* (1588), caused great discussion on account of the author putting forward claims for the Intense Diatonic system of scale demonstrated by Claudius Ptolemy, 130 A. D. For this Zarlino was fiercely attacked, but not worsted in the fight. It tells how clearly the man saw the truth of his theories when now after four centuries nearly all that he advanced is followed in practice. But in his own day his adversaries did not hesitate to use the most violent and opprobrious terms towards him. Like all men of great mind and foresight, he recognized the shortcomings of his contemporaries and advocated a system which he believed would be of greater benefit to music.

If we argue that these children of the Catholic Church were the guardians of the art throughout the ages; that only for their labors of love music would indeed be in a bad state to-day, some one may object that after all their work by no means shows what the attitude of the Church itself was. But that attitude is very clear. From the time of St. Paul's admonition to the Colossians (iii., 16) and Ephesians (v., 19) to cultivate song, the Catholic Church has ever shown a love for the art. She encouraged it in every possible way, and under her fostering care it progressed. Those who have read history cannot but be struck with the many tokens of esteem and honor that the Popes showered on men gifted in music. And it is principally by reason of Papal patronage that the works of the great composers have been kept from perishing. It is well worth remarking how some of those who wholly and solely devoted their lives to music were treated by the ecclesiastical authorities.

Hucbald, it is said, was persecuted by his uncle, the Abbot of St. Amand, and driven from the monastery. Yet it is a strange thing that the expelled monk was immediately received, and apparently given the mastership of music at Nevers, going from thence to St. Germain d'Auxerre, and later on returning to his own monastery of St. Amand to take charge of the music there. The story of persecution bears on its surface the appearance of a fabrication and of being unworthy of credence. A precisely similar story is told in connection with Guido d'Arezzo—that he also was driven out of his monastery. In those far-off times, though monks suffered occasionally from overbearing superiors, there were easier and by far more effective means of venting the spleen of jealousy than by driving a religious out of a monastery. But apart from this it is striking that both men found remarkably good positions at once in other monasteries. Guido wound up his career by becoming abbot of Santa Croce, at Avellana, after being honored by a call to Rome by Pope John XIX., who begged him to remain in the city and teach

music. Hugh di Vercelli was a Bishop of high repute; Simon Tunsted became provincial of the Franciscans in England; Tinctoris was a priest and became a canon of Nivelles after he had served as chaplain to the King of Naples; Zarlino was thought so highly of by the authorities of the Church that he was chosen Bishop of Chioggia (his native town), but the Doge and Senate of Venice, where Zarlino was organist of St. Mark's, not wishing to lose him, made such strong opposition that he relinquished the see; Genet, called Il Carpentrasso, was consecrated Bishop and honored by Leo X. in a very special way. Instead, then, of marking out those who devoted themselves to music as the objects of persecution, the Church gave them her patronage in a marked degree.

The history of composition in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries centres round the Pontifical Chapel and the basilicas of Rome. Thither went those who were musically gifted, and so far as I can ascertain no one with talent had ever to leave the Papal dominions for want of regard or patronage. The modern history of music since the old condition of things was overturned by the sixteenth century revolt is very different. Formerly the patrons—the Sovereign Pontiffs—were men of learning, the illustrious of their age. Their love of learning was so great that they gathered around their court all the best minds of the Christian world. Nothing but the highest aims of art were considered worthy of being followed, and artists vied with each other in seeking the sublime and beautiful. Modern patrons, on the other hand, are to a considerable extent very different—men who help on music by setting the lowest standards of taste and by creating names for composers who should never have been heard of. If such men be not the patrons, then the composer falls back on that will-o'-the-wisp guide known as public opinion. To be a popular composer pays infinitely better than to work for art's sake, which was the aim of the great masters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The patronage of the Popes was imitated in the various centres of learning and in the great episcopal sees throughout Europe. Rome was naturally looked on as the centre of all learning, as it was of Christianity, and the approbation of the Pope was sought by all who wished to succeed in a musical career. There was so much intellectual activity in the Eternal City that it was almost impossible for a gifted man to escape notice and, as a natural sequence, assistance throughout his career from the Pope and Cardinals. Hence it was that an unknown country youth like Palestrina wended his way to the city and worked for recognition. For whole generations a stream of musicians went from the Netherlands, from all parts of Italy and Spain. Few names are more honored in the history of

music than those of Dufay, Josquin des Pres, Orlando di Lassus, Morales, Vittoria, who had come to Rome from afar. Some musicians went there of their own accord to seek aid; others were invited. Whenever the fame of a composer reached Rome it was not long before he was called to the city by the Pope. This was the case with Josquin des Pres, whom Sixtus IV. bade come to raise the standard of music in the Pontifical Chapel. John XIX. had previously done, as we have seen, the same with Guido d'Arezzo. Bardi, one of the originators of opera, was summoned from Florence by Clement VIII. Urban VIII. took Allegri from Fermo. Jomelli was summoned from Naples and became the protégé of the Cardinal Duke of York (1740). And Corelli lived nearly all his life in the palace of Cardinal Ottoboni, who was continually working for the good of art and assisting artists in every possible way.

The well-worn calumny that the Church is the foe of all knowledge; a tyrant, curbing every attempt at advance in science and art, has not even a shadow of foundation in the history of music. It will be found, moreover, that not only in music and art—in its widest application—but in every pursuit of learning the Church has encouraged and rewarded legitimate research. Its very constitution as a corporate body, however, brings painting, sculpture and music more prominently in view. And it will be found that there is no nation, no society, no collection of men, under whatever term you may wish to class them, that has done so much for the arts as the Catholic Church. Epitomizing our knowledge of the history of music, we can say that, while it lay in the power of the Popes, whenever a talented musician was discovered he became the recipient of the highest honors and the most lucrative posts that the Pontiffs had at their command. The positions of honor did not, perhaps, bring with them the same ease and luxury that many of the present day give. But on this point there is a curious anomaly staring us in the face. While the mediæval musicians were for the most part content with little more than the necessities of life, so long as they felt that as musicians they were held in esteem and honor, our moderns put the position and honor of their calling in the secondary place and look for the material advantages.

Looking back over the centuries, no student of music who is not blinded by prejudice of the grossest kind can help feeling grateful for the part the Catholic Church has always played towards the art. The Popes were not alone in showing their love for it. The Bishops in their various sees, having before them the example of the Pontiffs and of that great lover of music, St. Ambrose, their canonized fellow-Bishop, freely gave their patronage and pointed out the use the art could be turned to for the benefit of religion. In Gaul the Bishops

did all they could to obtain the purest form of chant and had schools of music erected in connection with their cathedrals. In England, where a love of ecclesiastical music was very strong, the ecclesiastics of the north vied with those of the south to acquire musical knowledge. Across the sea was Ireland, traditionally the land of song, with monasteries dotting it all over and the chants of the Church heard from morning till night; where Bishops could be seen (as Giraldus Cambrensis tells us) in the twelfth century going on their journeys harp in hand; where there was a proverb that "poor indeed is the church that has not music." In all countries the Church was helping on the cause of the art.

Then grew up gradually those schools of composition which had their first inspiration in the pure strains of Church song and in the *Scholae Cantorum* of early times. And that song in its turn owes in no small degree its perfection to the work of the Hellenistic Popes from St. Agatho (678) to Zachary (752); to the zeal of St. Gregory, and to lovers of music like St. Isidor of Seville; Amalarius, the Deacon of Metz, who flourished about 830; Aurelian of Reome (circa 850), or Regino of Prum (915). We can never fully account for what these and other workers did for music. Some were laying the foundations of church chant by obtaining the purest versions of what already existed; by casting aside what was corrupt and recording the true forms of it. Others, again, were devising systems of notation, or endeavoring to unravel the mysterious laws that caused one combination of sounds to be tabooed and another to be acceptable and agreeable. Others were devoting themselves to composition in its highest branches. In one way or another work was continually going on. And the workers were encouraged by remembering that they were following in the footsteps of those who not only had the approval but the blessing of the Church on their work.

Sooner or later historians of music must see that the work done by the mediæval Church deserves close attention, and that the minutest investigation will yield rich results. Those who will make an honest endeavor to pierce into the so-called Darkness of the Middle Ages will lift their heads from the pages of history amazed at the injustice done to those times by men who claim to be heard in the interests of truth. And they shall become filled with admiration and wonderment at the labors and successes of the children of the Catholic Church during those times when the corner-stone and foundations of our modern art of music were laid, truly and well.

EDWARD F. CURRAN.

FRENCH MISSIONERS IN INDIA.

WHILE an anti-Christian government in France is waging war upon the Church and striving, by a process of starvation and spoliation, to extinguish Catholicism in that country, it is a singular instance of the irony of history that the very religious orders which the intolerant faction who hold the reins of power at the Elysée Palace are despoiling and dispersing enjoy the fullest freedom of action in dominions under the sway of a professedly Protestant power like England.

The work of the French Capuchins in India is a very timely object lesson in civil and religious liberty, full of point and pertinence at this moment. The territory ecclesiastically assigned to the mission confided to the Capuchins of the Province of Paris belonged, ten years ago, to the Archdiocese of Agra. In the second half of the sixteenth century Agra, which in the reign of Akbar received almost favorably the preaching of the Blessed Rodolph Acquaviva and his companions, had, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, become the see of an immense Vicariate Apostolic. Thibet-Hindostan comprised the whole valleys of the Ganges and the Indus and extended from Sindli to Bengal and from Himalaya to Barbada, or the entire of North India, with its population of 108,000,000 souls—a region too vast, assuredly, for the handful of Capuchin missionaries whose labor was almost sterile. Agra, Patna and the Punjab had been detached therefrom before the erection of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in 1886 by Leo XIII., when Agra was made an archiepiscopal see, with Allahabad and Lahore as suffragans. From these three dioceses, still too large, were further detached three Prefectures Apostolic—Allahabad and Bettiah, Lahore, Kashmere and Agra and Rajpootana.

At the time when Propaganda was contemplating this last subdivision the Parish Capuchins were already missionaries abroad. As chaplains of the French Embassy at Constantinople, they had made the chapel of St. Louis a centre of religious attraction to the European colony and founded the native seminary, now so flourishing. In July, 1890, that portion of the Archdiocese of Agra called Rajpootana was exclusively confided to the fathers of the Paris Province, with the special objects of Christianizing the infidels and preparing the way for the formation of a native clergy. The military occupation of India by the English was almost continually bringing into these immense districts some priests, scattered over the province of Agra, and whole regiments of Irish soldiers, to whom they acted as chaplains. Missionary work, properly so called, was

necessarily neglected. The number of missioners increasing, such a state of things was no longer permissible, and Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of Propaganda, said so distinctly to the French Capuchins chosen for the mission. Towards the close of 1890 three priests and two lay Brothers left France, and, after receiving at Rome the Pope's blessing, embarked for India, which they reached on November 21, applying themselves at once to the study of the native dialects, customs of the country and methods of evangelization.

The mission of Rajpootana comprises three great natural divisions—the tableland of Malwah to the south, perhaps the most fertile land in India, producing two successive harvests, one in October and another in March; Oriental Rajpootana, to the east of Arawah, with mountainous forests rich in pastures and fertile valleys, and Western Rajpootana, with its immense sandy plains, extending from the most arid zone of the globe, which they touch to the west, to the foot of the Arawah, where they become arable. The population of the mission then consisted of 14,000,000 inhabitants, including about 800,000 Mohammedans, 6,000 Protestants of different sects and 2,000 Catholics.

Of the seven great ethnographical families now recognized in India, four occupy the mission field—the Dravidians, regarded as descendants of the primitive inhabitants and who are found in the oldest geological formation of the peninsula; the Indo-Aryans, whose physical features and social characteristics differentiate them from the rest of the Indian people, and whose remote ancestors are assumed to have immigrated *en masse* from the tablelands of Eastern Persia and Beluchistan; the mixed type of Aryo-Dravidians and the Scytho-Dravidians.

In 1890 the mission only counted one native station, Jeypoor, in charge of an old Italian priest, Father Conrad; not but that there were other stations and other priests, Father Patrick,¹ an Irishman, looking after the Eurasian and Goanese population at Ajmere, while the garrisons of Nassirabad, Nimach and Mhow absorbed the activity of three military chaplains. The enterprising and energetic Father Pius of Benevento obtained from the government a site and grant for a church at Mhow dedicated to the Sacred Heart. The mission also owes to him the residence of the missioners, the chapel of St. Anthony and the Catholic cemetery; and at Indoor, where a

¹ Presumably the late Rev. P. J. Knaresboro, O. S. F. C., a native of Kilkenny, and formerly of the Irish Capuchin province.

² Founded at Angers in 1871 by Father Chrysostom, O. S. F. C., under the auspices of Mgr. Freppel. They now number forty-three in Rajpootana, including thirty-two choir Sisters, and have three residences—Mhow, Ajmere and Mariapoor. The first superioress at Mariapoor, Mother Mary Paul, died of cholera during the great famine of 1900.

detachment of troops from Mhow necessitated the regular visit of the chaplain of that station, a church and presbytery.

By a decree of Propaganda Rajpootana-Malwa was on March 17, 1892, erected into a Prefecture Apostolic, and by a further decree of April 10 the Very Rev. Father Bertran de Dangeul, of the Province of Paris, was nominated Prefect Apostolic, thus officially establishing the mission of the French Capuchins in India.

Father Bertran from the start secured the valuable assistance of the nuns of St. Mary of Angels, Angers,² who, after their arrival in November, 1892, opened boarding and day schools for English-speaking girls and free schools for poor children, similar schools for boys being established at the missionaries' residence. This Christian population consisted of poor people from Goa and Madras, often sunk in vice and ignorance.

As soon as the missionaries had acquired a sufficient knowledge of the native language they traversed the neighboring villages and fraternized with tillers of the soil. The Bhil race seemed to offer the most promising field of missionary labor. They came in contact with these primitive people on the uplands of Piplia and Manglia, to the south of Mhow, and several times shared with them their meagre allowance and slept in their mud hovels, celebrating on the morrow the Holy Sacrifice for the first time in the rocky wilds of the Vindhya. Provisionally established at Manpore, they sought to find a firmer foothold at Garaghat, a few miles from thence, in a picturesque place facing the mountains and on the edge of precipices, below which foaming torrents pour down in resounding cascades. But this had to be abandoned. It was very picturesque, but very solitary—admirably adapted for a Carthusian monastery, but inadmissible as a missionary centre. They had to push farther afield, and met with resistance from the Bheel tribes; and when malaria seized the missionary, after a year's prospecting, they gave it up.

In January, 1896, Father Bertran sent another missionary, Father Charles, to attempt a new foundation in the Bheel country. After scouring the country for a month, living under a tent, he finally fixed his post at Thandla, a small native village a few miles from the Bajraugarh station, where he lived for two years with his companion, Brother Meinrad, in a small house in the midst of the bazar or marketplace, much frequented by the Bheels, scattered over a radius of twenty miles around. They were years of great privations. The father went from village to village catechising, while the Brother dispensed medicines and acquired a reputation as a great doctor among the natives; so that Thandla will long cherish the memory of the "Dokra-Doctor," or Old Doctor, as they called him. He was a favorite with the Brahmins as well as with the lower castes; went

everywhere, and wherever he went visitors crowded to his dispensary. His popularity, for he was very well liked, counted for much in the establishment of the Thandla mission; he was so good, so gentle, so willing to please everybody. The natives had almost as great a veneration for him as for the Divinity; for to them patience and placidity are the acme of virtue, Europeans in general being so *ghussarwala*, so impetuous—their ideal of the profane man, the sinner!

After two years, through the intermediary of the political agent of Sirdarpore, Father Charles obtained a piece of ground at the entrance of the village, sufficiently out of reach of people's importunity and yet in proximity to visitors, upon which he built at little cost a small chapel and a maisonette with a veranda. Up to that time he had not made any conversions. They left the missioners at peace, which was something. Somewhat dreaded as *Franghis*, they found them useful, as they cured diseases, but remained deaf to their preaching. "It is very true what you say! (*Khari bat! Yah to salû*)" they would say; and they stopped there. These formal expressions in the mouth of a Hindoo are not even approvals, as one might think; they do not even theoretically imply adhesion. It is the natural and unemotional exclamation which spontaneously escapes the lips of an Indian who hears a story. The word "true" has not absolutely the same meaning to him as to us. One would think so, to see him docile and attentive; he remains candidly indifferent, unconcerned; he is not touched. One might say that he hides his thought under the words he employs. Who could say if he has even a thought?

A year passed thus without any glimpse of hope. That made three years. Still an enormous result had been reached. The missioners had gained the sympathy and veneration of the poor. The lower castes, less proud and consequently less removed from God, willingly drew near the father, and a day came when the latter felt himself repaid for all the privations endured and the weariness of long waiting.

In 1896 the French nuns opened a day school at Ajmere, the capital of Rajpootana, where, as teachers, they have acquired a well merited reputation in North India. In four years seven of these excellent religious, unrelaxing in their labors in the class room, the orphanage and in the fields, sacrificed their lives for the salvation of the Indians.

At some distance from Ajmere, on the road to Nasirabad, after passing the vast railway works to which every morning throng thousands of native workmen, is met the village of Singachauri. On the outskirts of this village, on an eminence overlooking the valley, Father Daniel, who then had charge of the Catholics of Ajmere,

built, in 1894, a rather primitive construction, serving at once as chapel and school, in which he gathered his catechumens—people from the surrounding villages—having undertaken the evangelization of all the environs of Ajmere and chosen Singachauri, with Madar and Ladpoora as points of concentration. His efforts at first appeared crowned with success. The number of catechumens was rapidly increasing, the neophytes displayed docility; in a short time he had nearly one hundred baptized. Then came trial—the usual trial at the beginning of an Indian Christian settlement. The heads of the caste, at first indifferent to a nascent movement, become watchful when it becomes marked, hostile if it threatens to become general. Then it is a question of choosing between Christ and caste, communion with foreigners or society with one's neighbors, friends and tribe. Many dropped off, and this defection led the prefect to think that the continual presence of the priest in the midst of pagans was an indispensable condition to their conversion. Consequently a new priest, just arrived in India, was sent to Ladpoora, the second station on the railway from Ajmere to Jaypoor (1896). He built himself an earthen hut, which he thatched, learnt the language of the country and lived on the native dietary. He would soon have died of it, for, undermined by fever, debilitated by an absolutely rudimentary diet, he had to leave after about a year and went to recruit his health at Mhow.

A native seminary was begun in the following year, 1897, at Jeypoor and placed under the direction of Father Paul. Like every other missionary work, it was a difficult undertaking, demanding much patience and reliance upon God.

About the same time Providence opened up another field of action for their zeal. Famine had made its appearance in the eastern portion of the mission. The prefect immediately sent priests to the poverty-stricken districts to baptize the children and gather together the orphans; and then went to France to beg for them, returning in December, 1897, to find a hundred orphaned boys and girls at Mhow, Ajmere and Jeypoor.

The year 1898 saw the completion of the Churches of St. Ann at Ratlam and of the Immaculate Conception at Ajmere, and 1897 the establishment of the first colony of children orphaned by the famine at Maupoor, the chief place of a small British reservation in the midst of the native state of Indoor. The chapel, dedicated to St. Anthony of Padua, was blessed on his feast, June 13, and the future village which was to grow up around chapel, orphanage and their dependencies, received in advance the name of the Virgin's Village—Maria-poor.

At this epoch the missionary labors of the French Capuchins began

to bear fruit in conversions. A lad of thirteen, belonging to the caste of weavers, asked to be baptized. Of an adventurous and mettlesome disposition, he seemed to fear nobody. He was instructed and, with his parents' consent, received baptism and took the name Paul. He became a sort of apostle in his way. His relatives and others of his caste gradually followed his example, and soon Father Charles counted twenty adult converts, ostensibly Christians and frequently approaching the sacraments.

While these conversions raised the hopes of the missioners and the outlook seemed encouraging, the horizon was darkened by the great famine of 1899-1900, which blighted the land and deprived the prefect of some of his most valuable auxiliaries. Brother Meinrad, Father Charles' companion, died of exhaustion at Thandla in September, 1900; Mother Paul, superioress of the girls' orphanage at Mariapoor, and Brother Francis, a tertiary at Mhow, succumbed to cholera. Three other missioners and a nun stricken with the same disease miraculously escaped death. The fathers baptized thousands of dying and gathered together a large number of children; but many of the latter did not survive the severe privations they had endured.

During the great famine the Capuchins acquired a rather considerable site quite near Ladpoora, where they established an orphanage for fifty boys, to which they gave the name of Josepoora, and where they had suffered much from the summer heat in the midst of the jungle without any habitation to shelter them by day or night.

A few months after this foundation Father Daniel, a pioneer of the Capuchin mission in the country of the Rajas, who had labored so zealously for the conversion of the native race in the environs of Ajmere, died on March 25, 1902, from tuberculosis. He was like a Franciscan of the primitive type come to life again, reproducing in these modern times the simple habits and methods of working of the Umbrian friars of the thirteenth century; going about on foot, accompanied by a catechist, carrying over his shoulder a little brown cloth sack containing his breviary, some of the simplest remedies, an illustrated catechism and water for baptisms. He also took with him an accordeon, would pause by the side of some well near a village and sing something in Hindostany, accompanying himself. He thus drew around him the peasants, who, resting on their heels and passing the pipe from mouth to mouth, listened to the music. When this was over the missioner, after reflecting for some moments, explained the Catholic doctrine with the aid of the illustrated catechism. He afterwards sent for the sick and needy, giving medicines to the former and alms to the latter. The sun would meanwhile have ascended the horizon and be shedding its scorching rays down into

the jungle. It being impossible to return to Ajmere without exposing himself to the risks of isolation or fever, he installed himself under a tree and shared his modest meal with some peasant, just as St. Francis did of old with the wayside beggar. At evening he wended his way back to Ajmere, thoughtful, with downcast eyes, telling his beads, as was his usual wont. Some days before the Christmas of 1897 he was seized with a spitting of blood, which revealed tuberculosis. He still labored for two years longer at Mhow and two years at Indoor, always leading the same mortified, zealous life, until, without any agony, he calmly expired. His death, which deprived the mission of a venerated apostle, was followed by the retirement of Father Bertran, worn out with care, weariness and sickness, after laboring unrelaxingly for ten years, traversing twenty times the large mission field from north to south during the terrible famine year (1900), present everywhere where drouth, destitution or disease made themselves felt, raising the courage of his missionaries, guiding them with his counsels, supporting them under trials and inspiring them with his example, until the work proved too burdensome for his enfeebled constitution. As soon as a temporary sojourn in a healthier climate effected a slight improvement he hastened to return to the field of battle, ready to still combat for the diffusion of the faith and the extension of the kingdom of God; but his malady, assuaged, not healed, reappeared in a more dangerous form, and, submitting to the Divine will, he resigned his charge into the hands of the Vicar of Christ, declaring himself incapable any longer of fulfilling its obligations.

His successor in the prefecture, Father Fortunatus, of Tours, in an interesting work³ on the origin and present condition of the Capuchin mission in Rajpootana, gives us his impressions and experiences of missionary work in India, which are very informing. He says there is not much to be expected from baptized adults. "Intelligence seems atrophied in those savage brains; even memory no longer exists, no more does will; slaves of custom, they are incapable of acting from personal initiative; their minds cannot grasp things which are outside the reach of the senses; they are led by instinct, and truly one hardly knows how to reach their souls. No doubt, God must be easier with them, but still they must be sincere, and it is never very clear that a pagan adult is so, although I have an idea that they may go farther in duplicity without being very culpable, once their mind is moulded in this fashion. In short, when they have been baptized, one can hardly do more than await their last illness; as they always die very resigned and the thought of

³ "Au Pays des Rajas. Les Débuts d'une Mission Par le Père Fortunat de Tours, Préfet Apostolique de la Mission du Rajputana." Paris, 1906.

God scarcely dismays them, there is room for hoping that their salvation is possible. It is otherwise with the children. There is the hope. The infant child certainly inherits from its parents, but one may form or, reform it if you will, not completely, at least to a very satisfactory degree. The experience of our orphanages demonstrates it. Their chief solicitude, then, at Singachauri was to improve the school. To reach that result Christian teachers were necessarily needed. The catechist, a Rajpoot, who up to that time taught the children, was no doubt baptized, intelligent, even fluent, but as far from the Christian spirit as the adults of whom I have spoken above. One could not count on him to direct pagan children towards Christianity. They knew that; but what was to be done? They had no one. Our nascent mission had not had time to also form serious catechists, and we had to use the instruments within our reach, such as they were. This explains a great number of the difficulties and disappointments of the first year.”⁴

The pupils are almost all of very low castes, as regarded in India, such as gardeners, wood-sellers, weavers and tanners, contact with whom is supposed to soil those of higher castes. The parents do not object to their children receiving religious instruction. The thirty-two children in the school at Parbatpoora, another village formerly Christianized by Father Daniel, are of a better caste and belong to an important clan in the country of Ajmere-Merwara, the Mhers or Mhairs, of the group of Sudras, from whom the regenerated—that is, the Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaisyas—cannot receive water, but whom they can approach and touch without contracting any contamination. At the time of the taking of Ajmere by the English in 1818, Merwara was a wild, unexplored country, inhabited by tribes of marauders who lived by pillage. In 1820-21 a regular expedition was sent to Merwara, when the district was conquered. In process of time a social transformation took place. These plundering bands abandoned their former villages, invariably perched on the tops of mountains, in inaccessible places—regular eagles’ nests, where they felt out of the reach of their fellows and wild beasts. They now settled down in valleys, took to work and applied themselves to agriculture. The Merwara clans claim to descend from Rajpoot chiefs who married daughters of the Minas, the primitive inhabitants of the country before the Aryan invasion. The Mhairs number nearly 22,000 and the Rawats, an allied tribe of the same origin, more than 32,000. These tribes were returned in the census of 1901 as of the Hindoo religion, but it is certain, as the official report remarks, that they are hardly slaves of Brahminical rites and customs, a fact which is some gratification to the

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

missioner. The Mhairs and Rawats appear to adore incarnations of Shiva under the names of Bhaironji and Mataji; but their religion is very undefined, and it is doubtful if it goes farther than the observance of certain marriage and funeral rites. They say, in a general way, that they adore Parmeshwar (the Supreme Being), but their ideas on the subject of religion are very few and very crude. If you persist in asking them what they precisely understand by Parmeshwar, they cannot express any clear idea. "What do we know of him?" replied a native thus questioned. "We have never seen him and do not know where he lives;" then suddenly adding, as if proud of his discovery or ready-wittedness: "The government—that's Parmeshwar." And all the tribe present applauded: "*Khari bat!* That's a fact!" Sometimes they will tell you that it is evil to lie and to steal; but they have only this notion of good and evil, that to be satisfied is good and to suffer is evil. "Sahib," they will say, "our stomach is empty, and that is ill; if it was full, that would be good. Beyond that we don't know anything." This is agnosticism in its naked simplicity, stripped of the learned verbage in which ignorance often hides itself among the cultured as well as the uncultured. With such notions, what can they conceive of a future of rewards and punishments? A vague idea of transmigration is found in some, but among the majority there is a total absence of any conception of moral responsibility and its consequences.

The Calai of Thandla after the first conversion in 1899 became Christians one by one. There were soon up to twenty-five baptized, faithful to their religious duties while continuing to belong socially to the caste. As they were scattered among almost all the families of weavers at Thandla, one might have said that the caste had become Christianized. This success, which lasted for four years, enraged the enemy of all good, and a terrible crisis came in 1903. On Sunday evening, September 5, the missionary heard that several Christians had gone to take part in a pagan ceremony organized by a *sadhu* or native Hindoo monk, their former *guru* or spiritual father. He at once proceeded to the place and found eight of his Christians present at the pagan festival. In compliance with his order they followed him to the mission residence, where they passed the night. The next day they assisted at Mass with arms extended in the form of a cross and voluntarily made an offering in expiation of their fault. But the caste, assembled in the afternoon, declared themselves offended by the priest's proceeding and forbade every one, under penalty of excommunication, to go to church. Excommunication is attended with terrible civil disabilities; it is interdiction from the home, from tobacco, water, food and marriage! It is being put outside the pale of the law and of society, banished from the only social

circle in which existence is possible. Loss of caste in this rigid sense of the word—as it is understood in the East, not in the West—you have no longer either relatives, brethren or friends; you are less than a pariah; you are a stranger to all, whom nobody would even think of helping in whatever necessitous position you were placed. Paul alone, the first convert, ventured to set at defiance the prohibition and continued to go to church. Through either weariness in bearing the Christian yoke, regret for their former pagan festivals or dread of expulsion from caste and being disowned by their families, all the other neophytes gave in. On September 21 the missionary held a two-hours' conference in presence of the assembled caste, but without any satisfactory result, as they all persisted in their decision. That evening violent hands were laid upon Paul by his old father and his kinsmen, who seized and struck him. Paul during the struggle cast off his turban and his tunic, saying: "Take what belongs to you," and took refuge with the missionary, pursued in his flight by the others, shouting: "Kill him! Fetch a sword! Go for the police!" The priest made his appearance on the scene and succeeded in appeasing these madmen. Paul had stood resolutely by the faith, like his name-saint, and made "a good confession before many witnesses." Almost every day he went to Mass. As to the others, it seemed to need a miracle to bring them back, and the intercession of Our Lady and St. Fidelis was sought to obtain their return. Their consciences were not at rest. Every night there were interminable theological discussions. "The father would pardon a homicide," they said, "but he won't allow the least superstition." At last a second neophyte, Michael, followed Paul's example, despite menaces and remonstrances from all sides. At the Sunday Mass, in presence of all the Bheel Christians, he publicly confessed his fault kneeling before the altar. A few timid backsliders put forward as an excuse for their moral cowardice that the missionary was too severe and forbade certain customs which they thought might be tolerated.

On November 7 the weavers outcasted the whole of Paul's family because they had not broken off relations with him. Then, seeing that rigorous methods were not successful, they tried a more insinuating way. "The caste does not want to ditch you from your religion," protested an old Hindoo ascetic to Paul; "all it asks of you is to cease to frequent the church on one or two Sundays until the prefect's arrival; then everything will be settled and the caste will proclaim religious liberty. Otherwise, note well, if you don't give in, we shall definitely abandon you and you will be out of caste forever. How long will you endure such a painful position? Will you, then, never need any one? Come, I beg of you, come back to

us with hands joined." That evening it required all the eloquence and moving tenderness of the father to repair in the souls of his dear neophytes the effects of such language. On the 20th the caste reassembled and there was an animated discussion for two and a half hours. Paul's eldest brother said: "My position is intolerable. The assembly is my father and mother; I beg of it, with head uncovered, to come to a resolution regarding mine and my brother's fate. Since he persists in going to church, if you don't wish to remove the prohibition in his regard, well, declare that he is no longer my brother; that he is dead to my family and caste. Break the rod!" Paul, being called upon to speak, exclaimed: "What have I done to be thus brought to trial? In what way have I broken the laws of our ancestors? Have I cut a cow's throat? Have I killed my father and mother? Have I committed adultery, because I go to church? I declare to you, I shall continue to go there, and no one in the world shall prevent me. It matters little breaking with you; as to leaving the church—never!" This bold declaration raised a storm. With a calm there came unanimity. They agreed to remove the prohibition to go to church, "For this stubborn fellow," they said, "is, after all, only a child."

It was next Michael's turn. "If you've removed the ban for Paul," he asked, "why not remove it for me?" Several cried out: "No!" and there were renewed vociferations. But the wisest intervened: "Why two measures?" they said. "If we allow it to one, we must allow it to the other." Then insults and threats were interchanged, and they were near coming to blows, when the indignant elders quitted the assembly without definitely deciding anything.

The next day there was another meeting and another attempt to shake Paul. "Take off your cross," they first said to him. "I shall never take off my cross," he replied. "Would the Rajah order it?" "At least abandon the church." "Never!" "Be it so. Go to church, but only on Sunday." "I shall go when I think fit, week-day or Sunday." They did not press their point.

Michael was called up. "Are you willing not to return to the church?" "No, I shall go when it pleases me. I wish to return to the caste, but I shall go to church." In presence of such resolute Christians, the fatigued assembly, wishful of having done with it, gave in. It was decided that Paul and Michael, while continuing to go to church, should be readmitted to the caste on paying a fine of three rupees. One of the most furious pagans said to Paul as he was going away: "You have conquered us; the assembly no longer amounts to anything; you have nothing more to do but to make us apologize."

The reason why the other native Christians did not display the

same firmness is ascribed partly to their timidity and to the yoke of the Gospel appearing too heavy to them, as if that of the caste was light!

The prefect, on his arrival a few days afterwards, effected a reconciliation between pagans and Christians, with a general permission to the latter to frequent the church. On the Sunday following a good portion were present at the service; towards Christmas all had returned, but many did not display the same assiduity as before.

"In the public discussion," says Father Fortunatus,⁵ "we had to speak in general terms and simply claim religious liberty in the unity of caste. If we had to precisely indicate what the Christian religion could not tolerate and the superstitious rites we had to suppress among Christians, I don't think the pagans would ever have given in. It is when the occasion presents itself that the Christian observance can be introduced by actual practice more than by a loud-voiced declaration of principles."

One of the methods of propagandism employed by the Capuchins was to marry young Christians to girls of the same caste brought up in their orphanage. Their success in this direction was impeded by new difficulties which it required all the tact of the missioners to overcome, three newly married couples incurring formal excommunication and all Christian or pagan weavers being forbidden not only to go to church, but even to the father's residence until the ban was raised, and they were reinstated by payment of a ransom of eight rupees for each family. To bring about a Christian marriage outside of and against caste and then to get the latter to accept the newly married and validate the affair was an achievement; but to have a Christian marriage take place under the eyes of the caste and with its participation, although the bride was still an orphan stranger, was better. Moreover, they consented to forego all the superstitious rites condemned by the missioners. So, on November 12, 1904, a Christian marriage was openly celebrated at Thandla, and after the nuptial benediction and Mass the civil ceremonies took place without the Brahmin and offerings to idols.

After this there was a lull. The movement in the direction of conversions, which began some years ago, seems to have stopped. The baptized have come back to the church, a certain number, however, without heartiness or regularity; some even have not fulfilled their Easter duty. A great difficulty to them is the cessation of Sunday work; being extremely poor, the loss of a day's earning means much to them. Despite all these obstacles, the Christian idea is making headway among them, and Father Fortunatus would not be surprised if one day all the weavers of Thandla were converted.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

The first Christian marriage among the Bheels took place on January 7, 1904, and drew together hundreds of the tribe for thirty miles round, curious to know what subsisted of the customs of their ancestors. Father Charles showed that the Church does not suppress innocent customs; he maintained some and transformed others, but retained enough to satisfy everybody. This priest has erected at Thandla a sanctuary to the Blessed Virgin in fulfillment of a promise he made when laid low with cholera in 1900, having received a site from the Rajah. It is hoped that this chapel, solemnly blessed on February 25, 1905, will become a place of pilgrimage for the Bheels of the surrounding country, dethroning the idols in which they now confide.

The Bheels, among the most warlike and predatory of the aboriginal tribes existing amid the mountain ranges of Central India, are a strange race. Wild and intractable as they were until reclaimed by Sir James Outram, after the Mahratta war, they have redeeming qualities and are very sympathetic, particularly towards children. "Our Lord ought to love them," writes Father Fortunatus, and then what has the future in store for them? There are more than 500,000 of these Bheels in our mission. Wild nomads; yes, but they are ignorant of the corruption and knavery of the cities. They are still, as a body, far from being incorporated in the hideous Brahminist army. Primitive they are, and it is that which at once captures the missionary's heart; living on nothing, almost naked, very simple, very timid, readily startled, like the antelopes of their jungles, whose nimbleness and fleetness they possess, freely imbibing the *daru* to put them in humor for dancing or give them the courage to take in hand some bad business; and, take them all in all, true, faithful, ingenious and bold. To sum up, when you have gained their approach and tamed them, so to speak, very susceptible of instruction, in which some display great quick-wittedness. Such they appeared to us. So they appeared, too, to the English officer. 'The tribes,' says the report on the census of 1901, 'who live in the wildest and most inaccessible parts of the country *never lie*. But their fellows who have come in contact with the civilization of the cities and small towns soon lose their old virtues. They erect their huts apart from the villages in order, they say, to protect their wives from too eager attentions of their neighbors. They have the greatest confidence in and the greatest respect for the *Sankar* (the British Government), and the English officer is generally sure that they will obey his orders and will not break their word.'"⁶

The building of the Church of the Rosary at Mariapoor, which is at once the conventual chapel of the nuns of St. Mary of Angels and

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

the parish church, was retarded by the appearance of the plague, to which so many fell victims during the monsoons of 1903 and 1904. But God visibly protected Mary's village; not a case occurred in it, while the scourge ravaged the country round about.

Despite the disquietude caused by such a situation, the mission work proceeded to develop. Every year new marriages were solemnized, bringing the number of Christian families at Mariapoor up to twenty-nine. The defection and departure of some of the converts convinced the prefect that the devil, by attacking the spiritual edifice raised with so much labor was seeking to be revenged for the public affront given him in his secular kingdom by the sudden appearance of a temple to the true God. The fugitives, however, with two or three exceptions, after frequenting the church and the sacraments where they found themselves, returned to the fold. But often in what a condition. "We had previously received their coming from their families, simple and docile. When they have rambled through the lanes of the bazars⁷ and outskirts of the camps, were it only for a few weeks, what a change in their character, their ideas and their conduct! And despite one is not easily resigned at their loss. Prodigal sons, as soon as they come back, the father, who was looking out for their return, opens his arms to them and receives them affectionately. Then there are young married couples who must be helped, encouraged and directed. It is a difficult work. They must get through it as best they can by themselves; they can do so easily if they live soberly and do not make useless expenditures. But they are still mere children and cannot do without the father's assiduous supervision. Moreover, they have not before their eyes, like the young people of the villages, the example of their parents working laboriously for a meagre subsistence. They are Christians, they are the father's children, and can hardly resign themselves to the condition of extreme poverty which had been their lot if they had remained pagans. Orphans in other missions have been seen to let their lands to Mohammedans rather than work themselves, content to lead an idle life. The crucial point is, then, that the perseverance of the new Christians and the final success of the work are intimately bound up with material well-being. They would have made very bad Christians morally if they had only been made materially indigent and mendicant, and they would only have been made mendicants if they had not been inspired with the love of labor and the spirit of thrift. Father Alexander has devoted himself wholly and solely to this phase of the work. Twenty-nine families—it is already quite a whole village. Last year (1905) our young farmers were not only able to pay back the advances that had

⁷ *I. e.*, market places.

been made to them, but have increased their stock. The one procured carts, others better bulls, cows, etc. Let us add that every family at the marriage receives a couple of oxen, the necessary farm implements, a house and some indispensable household utensils to the value, in bulk, of nearly 300 francs (£12). They have to pay rent to the government for three hectares of land (6 acres, 3 roods, 105 perches) allotted to them."

In the establishment of new mission centres or stations among the Bheels, a project conceived by Father Bertran in 1897 was realized a plan which the penury of the workers had retarded for ten years. Experience shows the necessity of increasing the missionary's sphere of influence as much as possible. If he entrenches himself in too restricted a corner or becomes a fixture, forming a kind of sacred cenaculum, shut out from the exterior world, through dread of the bad influence of the latter upon the privileged souls under his assiduous care, he goes outside the evangelical tradition. As a matter of fact, the influence of Father Charles already radiates for ten miles around Thandla. To establish on the confines of this influence a new centre of evangelization seemed opportune, and Jhabua was chosen. To the south of Thandla and belonging to the same native state, of which it is the capital, Jhabua is on the highway which connects Thandla with Mariapoor. It is a small town with about 4,000 inhabitants, built at the base of the mountains, in a very rough country, on the borders of artificial ponds. The missionaries have already gained the sympathy of the Bheels of the villages, and daily draw crowds by the renown of their medical skill and their winning ways. The first thing is to get the approach of these people, to gain the good-will of these pagans, and enter into their confidence, and then to bring them in contact with God; to suggest to them in their wants—and their needs are many—to have recourse to Divine Providence, so powerful and so loving in Its compassionate solicitude for humanity at large—in a word, to prayer—praying along with them; to inspire them with confidence as well as with fear of displeasing God by sin, with the desire to keep His commandments and to receive baptism. It ordinarily takes long to lead up to this, but the missionaries are not discouraged, for their hearts are in their work.

And their work has prospered. At Ajmere, the chief place of the Capuchin mission of Rajpootana, a city of 73,800 inhabitants, where the population has more than doubled since the construction of the railway in 1879 and the opening of the railway works, the Catholics increased more than any other creed during the ten years preceding the census of 1901, which returns them as numbering 776 in the English district of Ajmere—Merwara and totaling 889 in the

whole ecclesiastical district of Ajmere, which comprehends, besides Ajmere, Joudpoor, Soojat, Beywar and Erinpoora. Mhow, a great military camp provided with two chaplains salaried by the government, counted in 1901 36,000 inhabitants, of whom 3,800 were Christians; the residence of Indoor, which comprehends Indoor and Mhow, containing 2,578 Catholics, of whom 1,040 were natives. The rather considerable number of European Catholics was then due to the presence of an Irish regiment, which has since left. The Catholics at present number 1,358. In two months—August and September, 1903—the plague swept away a hundred Madrassians and Goanese. It ravaged Mhow with particular violence, its victims numbering 7,000.

Among all the Mhow Christians the Madras community attracts special attention from the point of view of its numerical importance, its social organization, analogous to that of the Indian castes, and the preponderating part the priests play therein. They are immigrants from the south, from Madras, Pondicherry and Bangalore. Socially they are pariahs whose contact sullies and whom every well-reared Hindoo avoids more scrupulously than he would fly from the vicinity of a person plague-stricken. Europeans are less exacting and employ them as coachmen, cooks and even hotel managers; *faute de mieux*, for castes not so low refuse to serve. They form, in certain southern missions, the most numerous fraction of the Catholic population, and, on the whole, give the priest who knows how to handle them firmly more consolation than many other Christians socially more honorable. The Capuchins at Mhow have about 380, most of them employed in the officers' and soldiers' kitchens. They are mostly the scum of the southern populations. The number varies very little despite the plague, cholera and small-pox, scourges which regularly afflict the people; the gaps are filled by fresh arrivals. It is noted that among these Madrasi are not found those numerous families which generally swell the poor and working class population. There are only, on an average, two, three and four children to each family. "And yet," comments Father Fortunatus, "we have not more than from thirty to forty Madrasi outcasted for disorderly living; which will not appear enormous if one thinks of the absolutely dependent condition of these poor people, the circumstances of their emigration, their immersion in a purely pagan *milieu* and their proximity to a military camp. The Madras community in Mhow is governed by customary usages which have the force of law within the purview of English justice, always respectful of liberties. The principal regulations of this code were set down on the arrival of our fathers in the mission and bear their signatures. As in every primitive social organization, the rule is theocratic, the

priest charged with the spiritual interests of the community becoming at the same time the almost chief, arbitrator and father. He is God's representative, God Himself, as they often say by an abuse of language which they borrow from paganism."⁸ He is assisted by a council elected by a general assembly, but is himself the judge, the assembly when sitting as a court only filling a rôle analogous to that of our juries. The priest alone has the right to a chair, the others being seated on mats. The *panchayat*, over which he presides, is a regular court, whose decisions are recognized by the English courts and, if necessary, enforced by the municipal police. Crimes which affect one not belonging to the caste or the general public order (murder, etc.) are withheld from its jurisdiction. "Discussion generally assumes an animated character of which it would be difficult to form an idea; one would say rather a tumultuous sitting of Parliament than the calm, reasoned study of a judicial cause in the temple of Themis. When, however, the father thinks that they have vociferated enough to be satisfied, whatever may be the issue of the affair, he delivers judgment, and the record of the judgment is drawn up and signed by all who know how to write. As a token of peace and fraternity, the pipe and tobacco are handed round and the court rises. The penalties inflicted vary from exclusion from caste to a small fine, not to speak of different public penances, such as hearing Mass on Sundays in the porch of the church, carrying the cross around the church after functions, the bastonnade, etc. The amount of the fines is divided into three parts, one for the church, the other for the community and the third for the members present at the *panchayat*.

Exclusion from caste is a very severe penalty, all the family of the excommunicated participating in his disgrace. All social relations with other Catholics is forbidden. The delinquent dare not enter the church to hear Mass, but stands humbly at the door, and is not permitted to receive Holy Communion publicly. If he dies before being readmitted to caste, he will not rest with his brethren. Even if he has repented at the last hour and received the last blessings of the Church, the social stain which he has incurred and which has not been removed, will pursue him in death, and his tomb will remain unhonored. If he dies without the sacraments, pagan pariahs will carry his body into the jungle. It is a terrible malediction, which every one dreads like hell and the salutary fear of which weighs with all its weight upon consciences in favor of duty.

"To act upon these rude, violent, passionate natures, fond of show and of coarse if not guilty revels, but strongly attached to the faith of their baptism, it will be understood," says Father Fortunatus,

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 74, 75.

"that the priest must arm himself as much with energy as patience, and oftener assume the tone of command than that of persuasion. Gentle invitations and hyperbole, euphemisms and veiled reproaches would make no way in their hearts, because they would not be understood. It needs something plainer, more brutal. With them it is desirable, above all, to speak frankly and call a spade a spade. In reality, the fathers best remembered by them are those who strove to restrain them by the ascendancy of their vigor rather than win them by the kindness of their procedure. They are far from being insensible to care bestowed upon them, but this care, to be appreciated, should assume a certain form; and they recognize themselves that, like undisciplined children, they need a master who corrects and grasps them firmly."⁹

Father Fortunatus has high hopes of the future. The total population of the mission is about 10,800,000, including 11,801 classified as Christians in the census returns of 1901, the Catholics numbering 4,521. As soon as a religion is provided with an agency of proselytism strongly constituted the increase of the Christian population is much more rapid than that of the total population. While the total population of India only rose from 287,314,671 in 1891 to 294,361,056 in 1901, the Christian population during the same time increased from 2,284,380 to 2,923,241. There has been, it is true, an extraordinary diminution (nearly four millions) in Central India and Rajpootana, but it is attributable to the dreadful mortality of the famine years. The number of Christians, on the contrary, is sensibly increasing. "The increase of the native Christians," says the report on Central India, "clearly evidences the work of the missions during the last famine. As to the Catholics, whose number is superior to that of other Christians, either Europeans or natives, their augmentation comes chiefly from the presence of the Royal Irish at Mhow." "The increase in the number of Christians," says the report on Ajmere-Merwara, "is attributed first to the share contributed by the orphans gathered in the different Christian missions during the famine, then to the natural increase, and finally to conversions. Among the various denominations, the Catholics are the most numerous, which is due, in a certain measure, to the presence of the Connaught Rangers at Nasirabad." The report on Rajpootana likewise assigns as a cause of the increase of the Christians the famine work. The disappearance of the two Irish regiments, of course, at once lowered the number of Catholics in the mission, which, nevertheless, increased from 2,370 in 1892 to 3,266 in 1905. The largest number of conversions (607) was made in 1899. The mission registers a total of 54,200 baptisms, including

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

1,539 adult converts, up to 1902. The baptisms average 6,000 and the adult conversions 171 annually.

"It did not take twenty years (1885-1901) for our neighbors of Chotanagpoor (Diocese of Calcutta) to make 90,000 conversions in the midst of a race akin to our Bheels," says Father Fortunatus. "When the first shake is given the whole edifice of paganism crumbles. India is beginning to lose its affection for its old sects. Faith in the *deota*, it cannot be denied, is receding in proportion as European education advances. Caste still holds out. The example of a Rajpoot Prince very much in evidence outcasted he frequents the society of Europeans and eats at their tables (admired, nevertheless, and envied by all his less daring compatriots) is not unheard of. I do not speak of those petty Kings to whom the European adaptation is a means of procuring them more pleasure and of living more shamelessly. The former, already numerous, have no longer prejudices; they have only instincts. The Brahmins, in view of this undeniable fact that religious influence is slipping from them, having, moreover, long lost faith—if they ever had it sincerely—have realized that they had to change their front. They, guardians of Aryan orthodoxy, now, as students, cope with the English colleges, come out first at the examinations and push themselves forward into positions of honor, lucrative employments and even public offices. They do not trouble themselves about the people and the religious rôle they formerly assumed in their regard; but they make it a point to hold their positions in the new society which is being formed and to remain the first order, if not the first caste. It is told that during the Transvaal war one, persuaded that the end of British dominion was near, and foreseeing the Russians masters of India, went to the other side of the Himalayas to study the language of the future conquerors in order to retain, under the Slav régime, the important post he held from the English.

"The people, then, at some future time, perhaps rather near, will find themselves freed from the tutelage of the Brahmins and the pressure of the Princes; there will then be neither the skepticism of the first, nor the libertinism of the second. It is then they will turn an attentive ear to the lessons of Christianity; then, if we were masters of elementary education, it would be easy for us to engender Christian faith in the hearts of the children of the people. All the world, at some time, will demand education. What is called modern civilization is progressing here by giant strides under English influence. Japan has been still more prodigious, but India is following the example of Japan. If, then, education is demanded, it is for us to be ready, for us to seize the unique opportunity which offers and to present ourselves to the Indians as the teachers they are seeking.

What is lacking to us to enter on this path? Missioners, resources."¹⁰

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

THE MAGNIFICAT, ITS AUTHOR AND MEANING.

I.

THE AUTHOR OF THE "MAGNIFICAT."

JUST three years before the nineteenth century closed, a French writer startled many people by a suggestion that our Lady's *Song of Praise* was really uttered by St. Elizabeth. As the century was ending, the supposition was repeated by a German Protestant of great influence. Then it was accepted by an English professor. And now, shielded by a few famous names, it has begun to win its way among the opinions of the younger men.

About twenty years before the end of the nineteenth century, two great English critics, Westcott and Hort, published an edition of the Greek Testament, in which they drew attention to the substitution of St. Elizabeth's name for our Lady's in certain Latin manuscripts. They themselves, as we all know, did not hesitate to reject the strange reading; but now it has found advocates able to reach larger audiences than those formed by students of Bible dictionaries and theological essays.

Therefore, I have ventured to write an account of the matter as clearly and as frankly as I can, and as far as possible, without technical signs and expressions. And relying on the evidence alone, I would not overburden the question at issue by multiplying references to modern books and opinions.

It is said that St. Elizabeth's authorship is proved by some copies, known to Origen, by the Latin translation of St. Irenæus, by three manuscripts of the Gospels in the Old Latin version, by a small Latin tract on the *Good of Psalmody*, by St. Luke's context, and by the suitability of the words to St. Elizabeth's condition. At all events, the question is clearly stated, and we can examine the evidence.

Origen's testimony in regard to the authorship is contained in the Latin translation made by St. Jerome at Bethlehem in the year of our Lord 389 and from the short homilies Origen had delivered

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 83, 84, 85.

in Alexandria about a century and a half previously. In the eighth of these the song is called the "Virginal Prophecy," and no less than five times it is expressly referred to our Lady. "Elizabeth," it reads, "prophesies before John. Mary prophesies before the birth of the Lord, the Saviour."

But the previous homily contains the sentences on which the objection is based. "It came to pass," runs the passage, "when Elizabeth had heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb and she was filled with the Holy Spirit. So there is no doubt that she, who was then filled with the Holy Spirit, was filled on account of her son. For the mother was not the first to merit the Holy Spirit; but when John, as yet enclosed in the womb, had received the Holy Spirit, then she also, after the sanctification of her son, was filled with the Holy Spirit. You will be able to believe this if you consider something like it in the case of the Saviour. As we discover in a considerable number of copies, Blessed Mary is found to prophesy. For we are not ignorant that, according to other copies, Elizabeth utters these words also. And so Mary was then filled with the Holy Spirit when she began to have the Saviour in her womb. For immediately upon her receiving the Holy Spirit, the builder of the Lord's Body, and when the Son of God began to be in her womb, she herself also was filled with the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the babe exulted in Elizabeth's womb, and she was filled with the Holy Spirit and cried with a loud voice and said: 'Blessed art thou among women.'"

Origen's argument, no doubt, illustrates the fallacy of false analogy, for the two cases differ greatly in regard to the nature of the children, the condition of the mothers and the mode of their miraculous conception. But his statement is immediately important on account of its reference to words uttered by our Lady and attributed by some copies to St. Elizabeth.

It has been suggested that when St. Elizabeth saluted the Mother of God as "Blessed among women," Mary, according to a considerable number of copies, answered, "And blessed is she that believed;" but other copies attributed these words also to St. Elizabeth.

If we assume that Origen really found the *Magnificat* ascribed to St. Elizabeth, it is difficult to tell why no other trace of such a reading is to be found in the manuscripts, versions and comments of Egypt and Syria among Catholics and heretics alike. And it is abundantly evident from his succeeding homily that no supposition of Elizabethan authorship was for one moment entertained by Origen himself, who, whatever his defects as a theologian, was certainly the greatest Biblical critic of his time and experienced in dealing with the evidence of manuscripts.

Regarding St. Irenæus, the proof of St. Elizabeth's authorship is of no greater value. Twice in his work *Against Heresies* he speaks of the *Magnificat*, but the passages only exist in a Latin translation made in the fourth century and apparently in North Italy. The place of its production will be found a matter of considerable moment as we review the evidence in favor of St. Elizabeth and find it limited to a comparatively small region near Milan.

St. Irenæus' first reference occurs in the tenth chapter of his third book. And in it he distinctly asserts that our Lady delivered the *Magnificat*, for he speaks of Gabriel's announcement to the Virgin, and asks, "Who reigns in the house of Jacob without intermission forever, except Christ Jesus our Lord, the Son of the Most High God, who promised by the Law and the Prophets He would make Himself the visible Saviour for all flesh, so He might become the Son of Man for this, that man also might become the Son of God? And on that account, and exultant, Mary, prophesying on behalf of the Church, was exclaiming, 'My soul magnifies the Lord.'"

The second reference by St. Irenæus to the *Magnificat* is in the seventh chapter of his fourth book. And in the Latin translation there is some manuscript authority for reading "Helisabeth" where the ordinary printed editions read, "Mary also said, 'My soul magnifies the Lord.'"

The passage tells of Abraham's exultation in seeing Christ's Day by the spirit of prophecy, and continues: "Simeon, of his seed, was really fulfilling the Patriarch's joy, and saying:

Now Thou sendest Thy slave away, O Lord, in peace,
For my eyes have seen Thy salvation,
Which Thou hast prepared in face of all peoples,
A light for revelation of nations
And glory of the people of Israel.

But the angels also announced great joy to the shepherds watching by night. But Mary also said:

My soul magnifies the Lord,
And my spirit exulted in God my Saviour.

Considering, then, that the earlier passage refers the song to our Lady and implies the identity of its author and the Virgin, addressed by Gabriel, we are compelled to regard the occurrence of St. Elizabeth's name in the second passage as a mistake of the transcriber. And such a blunder will occasion us less surprise when we note how other fourth century copyists in North Italy altered their Latin texts.

Of the Old Latin Gospels there are three manuscripts which substitute "Elisabet" or "Elisabel" for "Mary" as the author of the *Magnificat*. They are among the representatives of a translation made originally in the region of Lyons or Carthage, and afterwards

carried to Italy. There is so much agreement among the copies of the Old Latin version that they are regarded as derived from a single work; and this must have been executed about the middle of the second century, for there are traces of it in the letter sent by the Church at Vienne and Lyons in the year 177 and preserved by Eusebius in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

Three years later the twelve Scillitan martyrs at Carthage confessed that they had not only the epistles of Paul, the just man, but also books which are understood to have been the Gospels; and having regard to the place and people, we naturally conclude that those volumes were in Latin. At the same Carthage, but twenty-eight years later, Tertullian was writing his work *On the Soul*, and he, who knew Greek and Latin, witnessed for manuscripts of both languages when he said in his twenty-sixth chapter: "Elizabeth exults; John within had impelled. Mary glorifies the Lord; Christ within had instigated."

St. Cyprian, who held Tertullian for his master, had been Bishop of Carthage for thirteen years at his martyrdom in the year 258. And his quotations from the New Testament enable us to form a standard, with which we may compare existing manuscripts. All the copies, which are described as Cyprianic and which contain the *Magnificat* passage, attribute the song to our Lady, and among these are such characteristic African copies as the Palatine and Colbertine manuscripts.

The Old Latin became more and more disfigured by alterations; and St. Augustine, in the second book of his *Christian Doctrine*, urged their correction by the Greek text. Yet still we find no African authority for ascribing the *Magnificat* to St. Elizabeth.

From Southern Italy we have Beza's famous manuscript in Greek and Latin. The Greek was evidently copied for church services, and the Latin represents sometimes a literal translation of the Greek and sometimes the Old Latin version as current in Italy. It belongs to the period after the death of St. Augustine, the latter half of the fifth century. In it the *Magnificat* is ascribed to our Lady, and as yet there is no trace of Elizabethan authorship.

The tradition at Rome was constant in favor of our Lady. There is no evidence whatever St. Elizabeth's name was substituted for our Lady's in any Old Latin manuscript at Rome, though the Italian copies became so corrupt that St. Jerome, when he made the Vulgate edition, complained to Pope Damasus there were almost as many forms of the text as there were copies.

As to the great editor and Biblical scholar himself, he had no doubt regarding the Marian authorship of the *Magnificat*, for in his first book, *Against the Pelagians*, he quoted the song as our Lady's,

and said that Mary called herself blessed, not by her own merit and virtue, but by the clemency of God, who was dwelling in her. - And he himself, in his Vulgate edition of the Latin translation, preserved the reading, "And Mary says," as the introduction to the *Magnificat*.

Among those whom St. Jerome honored was Juvenius, the author of a poem on the *Gospel History*. This work, the first Christian epic, was composed in Vergilian measure and written probably at Rome during the peace which followed Constantine's victory in the year 323, for then, according to the author, the peace of Christ and the world's peace, preserved by Constantine, enabled him to weave an ornament of song for the glory of the Divine Law. He says our Lady remained with St. Elizabeth three months, and not about three months. In this and other statements he shows he is following the Old Latin version; and he witnesses to the reading of his own copy when he asserts the Marian authorship of the *Magnificat*. He, of a noble Spanish family, sang with fervor of the noble Jewish maiden and paraphrased the song in which she told God's will, that all nations and ages should account her blessed.

Following the track of the Old Latin version, we reach the north of Italy, and at last find some mention of Elizabethan authorship. St. Elizabeth's name is substituted for our Lady's in three Old Latin manuscripts. One, the Rhedigerian, belongs to the seventh century and would have little or no value in our present question were it not for its agreement with the two manuscripts of the fourth century. Of these the one is named from Vercelli and reads "Elisabet" instead of "Mary." The other is named from Verona and reads "Elisabel." Vercelli lies on the west and Verona on the east of Milan, where St. Ambrose was Bishop when these two manuscripts were copied.

The Verona copy is noted for wilful alterations of the text, and in its version of St. Mark's Gospel it represents the Gadarenes as requesting our Lord not to depart from their regions. If the Vercelli manuscript tells us *His parents* did not know of it when Jesus remained in Jerusalem, the Verona copy says that *Joseph and his mother* did not know of it. Then the Corbeien copyist, noting that the Verona Latin would mean Joseph and Joseph's mother, altered the text and made it say that Jesus remained in Jerusalem, and *Jesus and His Mother* did not know of it.

offer. When St. Augustine was there it appears he met a more

But it will be well to consider what evidence Milan itself may accurate form of the Latin New Testament than that in the ordinary copies of the Old Latin version. And this Italian edition is well represented in the Brixien and Monacen manuscripts, which name Mary as the author of the *Magnificat*.

St. Augustine himself had no doubt in regard to the question,

for in one of his sermons on St. John the Baptist he quotes the words:

Hungering ones, He filled with good things;
And rich ones, He sent away empty,

And he adds: "See what is said by Mary herself, full of faith, full of grace, about to become a Mother and remain a Virgin."

And St. Ambrose, the great Bishop of Milan, who baptized St. Augustine in that city, was equally free from any difficulty in regard to the Marian authorship, for he explained why it is not said that Mary was filled with the Spirit, but that her own spirit exulted. "The Incomprehensible," said he, "was incomprehensibly operating in His Mother." So he not only witnesses to the belief of his time and to the evidence of his own manuscripts regarding our Lady's authorship, but he provides us with a refutation of those who to-day insist that the *Magnificat* must be included in St. Elizabeth's utterance, on the ground that our Lady's name must be an interpolation, because there is no mention of her being filled with the Holy Ghost. Certainly a history mechanically constructed would have been careful to append the phrase to every speaker. But the Gospel omits it in our Lady's case, and with how good a reason St. Ambrose has shown.

St. Augustine had a friend in St. Paulinus of Nola, near Naples; and he, in turn, had a friend in Niceta, a Bishop in Dacia, on the Danube. To this brave man, laboring among the Goths, is ascribed a little tract on the *Good of Psalmody*, which is said to uphold the Elizabethan authorship of the *Magnificat*. Twice he visited St. Paulinus, once in the year 398 and again in 402. So his testimony may be dated about the year 400, and it is the more interesting because he is now regarded as the author of the *Te Deum*. In his tract on psalmody there is a passage which runs: "And when the son of promise had been born, Elisabeth ceased not to magnify God from her soul." It is not, however, quite plain from these words that Niceta was intentionally referring to the *Magnificat*, for that had been uttered three months before John was born, and Niceta's reference is to the continual praise which followed the birth. A few lines further he adds: "With Elisabeth, our soul magnifies the Lord." Again, a difficulty arises, for the words may refer to the praise he has just described as following St. John's birth, and the sentence is omitted in five of the seven manuscripts containing the tract.

But assuming that Niceta was referring to the *Magnificat*, it is necessary to find the value of his testimony and to see whether it belongs to the small group of North Italian witnesses represented by the manuscripts of Vercelli and Verona, with the much later

Rhedigerian copy. For, if his evidence is not independent, then all the definite testimony to Elizabethan authorship is limited to a small district outside Milan and that at the close of the fourth century.

The question is not difficult to determine. At Constantinople, in the year 341, nearly sixty years before Niceta visited Italy, Ulphilas was consecrated Bishop for the Dacian Goths, among whom Niceta was afterwards to live and work. Having labored for about ten years in Dacia, Ulphilas was compelled to retreat into Moesia. About that time he invented the Gothic alphabet and translated the whole of the Bible, except the warlike *Books of the Kings*. And in his Gothic version we find the *Magnificat* prefaced with the words, "And quoth Mary."

As Ulphilas was the Apostle of the Goths in Dacia, it is evident that Niceta, if he really held the Elizabethan authorship, must have found that supposition elsewhere than in Dacia. And as the only manuscripts in which we find the view represented belong to North Italy, we are compelled to infer that Niceta learned it there on his way to visit Rome or St. Paulinus.

The testimony of Ulphilas is the more valuable because he was consecrated at Constantinople and returned to that city in the year 380, at the close of his career. The tradition he delivered to the Goths was therefore that of Constantinople. And so he becomes one of those who, on behalf of that city, witness to the Marian authorship of the *Magnificat*.

It is unnecessary to repeat the evidence of Niceta's contemporaries—St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and St. Jerome. And were the question to be settled by the voice of Europe and Northwest Africa, there is overwhelming testimony of churches and manuscripts in favor of our Lady's authorship. But the East also has a right to speak, and it knows no hesitation in ascribing the song to her. Then, as we have traveled from Carthage to Rome, from Rome to Milan, from Milan to Dacia and from Dacia to Constantinople, we may continue our pilgrimage and hear the voices of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt.

As the East recognizes no difficulty at all in regard to the matter, little more is needed than a few references to representative men, manuscripts and versions. Asia Minor would be well represented by the Bishop of Cæsarea. He, St. Basil the Great, understood something of textual questions, for he had himself corrected a manuscript. And as to the *Magnificat*, there is a plain statement in the commentary on *Isaias* ascribed to him, and with reason. The volume was certainly written within a decade after the year 360, during the Anomæan controversy, and more than thirty years before Niceta visited St. Paulinus. According to the eighth chapter, no

one could deny Mary to be the prophetess in the Isaian passage, if he would only recall to memory the words she uttered prophetically. "For what does she say?" it asks, and then continues: "My soul magnifies the Lord."

Northern Syria is voiced by another of Niceta's contemporaries, Severian of Gabala. This man was left in Constantinople as deputy for St. John Chrysostom during the year 401. And though he was accused of betraying his trust, he was described as learned in the Divine Scriptures. In his sixth oration on the *Creation of the World* he declares that Mary daily hears all pronounce her blessed, she being indeed filled with the Holy Spirit. And he enjoins his audience to hear what the Virgin herself says in her prophesying. Then he continues, illustrating both carelessness of quotation and belief in the Marian authorship of the *Magnificat*:

Blessed is the Eternal, the God of Israel,
Because He looked upon the lowliness of His slave;
For, from now, all the generations shall call me blessed.

Edessa and the Syrian Valley of the Euphrates are represented by Tatian, St. Ephraim and the Syriac versions, and these are unanimous in witnessing to our Lady's authorship. There were three great editions of the Syriac version. The Old Syriac Gospels, in which the four histories are separate, was made in the first half of the second century. About the year 173 a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, was made by Tatian, a disciple of St. Justin Martyr; and a commentary on this Harmony was written by St. Ephraim just two centuries later. The *Peshitta*, or Simple Edition, now known as the Syriac Vulgate, was made about the year 400 by a contemporary of Niceta. All these confirm the Marian authorship, her name being preserved in every Syriac manuscript, which contains the *Magnificat* passage of St. Luke's Gospel. And in the twelfth of his *Hymns on Blessed Mary* St. Ephraim writes:

All generations shall call me blessed,
Says Mary, with exultation.

From Asia Minor and Syria we pass to Egypt, where our oldest Greek manuscripts were copied, and they, as all the Greek manuscripts, read "Mary" and not "Elizabeth." The Greek Fathers also have never a doubt on the subject. A few years before St. Augustine's death St. Cyril of Alexandria was commenting on the prophet *Aggaeus*, and towards the conclusion he wrote that the holy and spotless Virgin, still bearing Christ in her womb, inasmuch as she was also full of the Holy Spirit, cried forth such words as these, saying: "He has put down the powerful from their seat."

Before the time of St. Cyril, and about the middle of the fourth century, St. Athanasius, in his *Commentary on St. Luke*, having

praised the glory of the Holy Virgin and Divine Mary, Mother of the Word, declared that the bearer of the Lord and Ever Virgin, when she knew what had taken place in herself, said: "From now all generations shall call me blessed." And a century before St. Athanasius, Origen, as his eighth homily on St. Luke abundantly proves, had no doubt the song was our Blessed Lady's composition.

These writers are supported by the two Egyptian versions of the New Testament. And whether these were made in the second, or the third, or the fourth century, the disagreement of critics in regard to that question does not affect our conclusion that the Egyptian tradition also witnesses to our Lady's authorship of the *Magnificat*.

Should the world run its present course for fifteen centuries more it will not then be persuaded that Bacon composed *Hamlet*, though it may find the authorship attributed to him in a pamphlet by a German professor who taught at the end of the nineteenth century. Nor will it avail, though the change of title be supported by three German copies, two of them published in the nineteenth century and the third to be published three centuries hence. No, not even should the legal references and the player's recitation be declared more natural in the case of the Chancellor than in that of the actor, with little Latin and less Greek.

As yet we have not examined the difficulties arising from the context and from the words of the *Magnificat*. But before entering on these we may pause a moment to reflect upon the chorus of testimony which acclaims the *Magnificat* as the Triumph Song of the greater Miriam, and confesses our Blessed Lady as Poet Laureate of God.

II.

THE MEANING OF THE "MAGNIFICAT."

It is said that the context of the passage and the words of the song itself do not allow us to acknowledge our Blessed Lady as author of the *Magnificat*. When the objections are more fully stated they are found to be three.

In the first place, Mary is not said to be filled with the Holy Ghost; and therefore, it is argued, her name has been interpolated and the *Magnificat* is really part of St. Elizabeth's utterance. But St. Ambrose explained that God was bodily present within our Lady. And it is also morally certain that if the history had been compiled mechanically or our Lady's name groundlessly inserted, the scribe would have added that she was filled with the Holy Ghost, if only to make the narrative symmetrical in its reference to the various speakers. But the omission of these words in our Lady's case is

evidently reasonable and designed. She alone bore the very Fullness of the Godhead bodily within her; and of her alone, the evangelist does not add, that she was filled with the Holy Ghost.

The second objection is based on the expression, "And *Mary* remained with *her* about three months." For it is suggested that our Lady being the author of the *Magnificat*, it would be more natural to add, "And *she* remained with *Elizabeth*."

The repetition of our Lady's name is nothing strange, as the narrative has been interrupted. And according to all authorities, except the Egyptian versions and three Greek manuscripts made in Egypt, there is a similar instance in the middle of St. Luke's twenty-second chapter. Our Lord has been warning and encouraging His disciples, and the record of His words is followed immediately by the sentence: "And the Lord said, 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan effectually asked for you, to sift you as wheat.'"

It is also to be noted that the pronoun employed in the sentence, "And *Mary* remained with *her*," is very freely used in Biblical Greek. And if we read the whole passage, we can see how well the expressions are balanced:

But *Mary* remained with *her* about three months,
And *she* returned to her house;
But for *Elizabeth* was fulfilled the time, that she should bring forth,
And *she* bore a son.

But the full difficulty arises from the reference to the speaker by name and to the other person by a pronoun. The style of St. Luke's first and second chapters, except the preface, is not Greek, but Aramaic, and therefore nearly related to Hebrew in form of expression. Then, naturally, we turn to the Old Testament in search of similar instances. And in the third chapter of Genesis we find such a case. We read that the Lord God said:

Behold, the man has become as one of us,
To know good and evil;
And now, lest he put forth his hand,
And take of life's tree also,
And eat, and live forever.

Then immediately the speaker is indicated by name and Adam by a pronoun. We might have expected the words, "And *He* sent *Adam* forth from the Garden of Eden." But as a matter of fact, we find, "And the *Lord God* sent *him* forth," just as St. Luke's Gospel reads: "And *Mary* remained with *her*."

There is another instance in the Hebrew *Books of Samuel*, in the first book, known to the Greek and Latin translators as the *First Book of Kings*. In the tenth chapter Samuel's words are reported and followed by a sentence in which he is again named, while the other person is merely indicated by a pronoun. We read that Samuel said to Saul:

Speak to the young man,
And he shall pass on before us.

And when the young man had passed on, Samuel added:

And thou, stand now,
And I will cause thee to hear the word of God.

Then the passage continues: "And *Samuel* took the flask of oil and poured it on *his* head."

If we need a third example, we can find one in the twentieth chapter of the same book. There a speech of Jonathan is reported. Immediately afterwards he is mentioned again by name and the other person by a pronoun. We read that Jonathan again adjured David in his love for him, for he loved him as his own soul. Then follows the sentence: "And *Jonathan* said to *him*."

But it is well to have our attention drawn to the relation between the song and its context. St. Elizabeth is seen to become suddenly conscious that she is in the presence of her Lord's Mother. "Blessed art thou among women," she cries. And again she raises her voice: "Blessed is she who believed." It would indeed be strange if St. Elizabeth then added in reference to herself: "All generations shall call me blessed." Surely it was not for St. Elizabeth to sing of herself in a scene of which her Lord's Mother formed the visible glory.

The third objection assumes that the *Magnificat* is unsuitable to our Blessed Lady and her circumstances. This question cannot be solved except by examining the actual words and considering, not isolated phrases, but the whole passage, which, it is necessary to remember, is distinctly Aramaic in character, some of the expressions being translations into Greek words without Greek idiom. And the song itself is formed in couplets of parallel lines, after the manner of Hebrew poetry.

The aged mother had exclaimed:

Blessed is she, who believed,
Because there shall be fulfillment of the things
Spoken to her from the Eternal.

No doubt this name of God is often rendered "Lord," but it has no article, and therefore corresponds in Biblical Greek to the most sacred Hebrew word, expressing Essential Being or Existence. So, as David had sung:

The Eternal said to my Lord;

and then glorified his Lord, who was also his Son; Mary turns to her Lord and Son within her, saying:

My soul magnifies the Lord;
And my spirit exulted in God my Saviour.

In the last phrase there seems to be such a reference to her Son's

Name, Jesus, as that in Lia's naming of a child Asher, or happy, and saying:

In my happiness,
For daughters shall call me happy,

or, as the Old Greek translation ran:

I am blessed,
For the women shall call me blessed.

Much has been written to explain how Mary magnified the Lord. St. Ambrose, adopting the suggestion of Origen, urged that the soul is the image of Christ, and He of God, so that if a soul does anything just or religious, it magnifies that image of God to which it has been created. Yet it is hardly necessary to press so much detail into an expression of simple and joyous reverence, for the word is used in the *Acts of the Apostles*, where it is said the people magnified the Apostles on account of the signs and wonders wrought by their hands.

But in the distinction between her soul's rapture and the fully conscious exultation with which her spirit, in both intellect and will, greeted her Personal and Divine Deliverer, our Lady not only transcends the triumph of Anna's heart and mouth and Anna's joy in the salvation God had given, but she expresses an even closer communion with her Lord than that of which the thirty-fifth Hebrew psalm prophesied, saying:

My soul shall exult in the Eternal:
It shall be glad in His salvation.

And the blessing of Mary shall be pronounced by others besides Elizabeth. It shall surpass Lia's in leaping from multitudes beyond the limits of Israelite women. Those, like Jahel and Judith, who were the blessed among women on account of a national triumph over temporal danger, yield their crowns to her whose triumph is for all the world and over supernatural foes.

Looking in upon her own soul, she sees nothing but her lowly condition and the favor of her Creator. Still she magnifies Him and exults:

Because He looked on the lowliness of His slave,
For, behold, from now all the generations shall call me blessed.

It was not for her to say that God had looked upon her humility, for self-conscious humility is none. But she spoke in Aramaic, and to translate her word the Greek text uses that by which the Old Greek translation had rendered the Hebrew word for "affliction." Nor is the language too strong, for she is not thinking of Israel's Royal House. But in the Presence of her Creator, she feels as all must feel, and more, for she is more conscious of His glory.

Anna, the mother of Samuel, had promised her child to the Eternal of Hosts if He on His part would surely look on the afflict-

tion of His handmaid. And the Old Greek translation rendered her words as the "lowliness of Thy slave." But our Lady makes no condition, for, having all, she needs nothing except to tell that God has looked on her lowliness and that all generations shall bless her. And as she speaks her gladness is like that expressed in the thirty-first of the Hebrew psalms:

Let me exult and be glad in Thy mercy,
Because Thou hast seen my affliction.

And the Old Greek translation mediates between the Hebrew psalm and our Greek Gospel by translating the psalmist's expression as "my lowliness."

The prophecy that our Lady's blessedness would be proclaimed by all has not caused its own fulfillment. All generations have, indeed, called her blessed; but the word was uttered as a natural expression of devotion to Mary and her Child. But from age to age there have arisen those who compelled loyal souls to adduce the prophecy in vindication of the title given as the spontaneous tribute of the heart. They who denied her glory ever went farther from the faith till they questioned her Son's title to their allegiance. But those who love her call her blessed, and her word confirms, but it could not originally have produced, that expression of honor and affection.

From her own soul she looked to God, the Creator of the universe, for He had called her and all things from nothing. And naming Him by one of His most sacred names, she says:

Because the Mighty One has done great things for me;
And His name is holy.

The title of the Mighty One had been given to God, her Saviour, in the prophecy, characteristically Isaian, of the Child, on whose shoulder would be the principedom and who would be named Marvel, Counsellor, God, Mighty One, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace. And Mary is faithful to the tradition of her people, for, like Old Testament writers, she links the announcement of God's holiness with that of His power. So in the *Eighteen Benedictions* of the Synagogue, if the second says, "Thou art the Mighty One forever," the third adds, "Thy Name is holy." In truth, the God of Israel was not a blind force or the Mover of the starry heavens alone. As little was He a philosophical abstraction or the unknown quantity in Nature's equation, for His was the Moral Law, and He required Israel to sanctify His Name. And as Mary proclaims the Essential Holiness of the Name, which means God Himself, her Son will teach His disciples to pray that all men may live in the light of that truth. "Let Thy Name be sanctified," completes the confession. "His Name is holy."

There is more in Mary's utterance than in these words of Anna:

There is none holy as the Eternal,
For there is none beside Thee;
And there is no rock like our God.

For a moment it would seem that our Lady says less than the psalmist, who chanted:

Holy and feared is His name.

But she looks upon the field of human history, and there she sees not only those who fear God, but also a great principle at work and revealing the Eternal as even more than Power and Sanctity. He is the Mighty One and the Holy One,

And His mercy is unto generations and generations,
To those who fear Him.

Though Power and Holiness and continual Mercy sum up, yet they do not transcend the revelation given to her people. The hundred and third of the Hebrew psalms had already declared:

The Eternal's mercy is from eternity and unto eternity
Upon those who fear Him,
And His justice to sons of sons,
For those who keep His covenant.

And the first of the Synagogue's *Eighteen Benedictions* appeals to God as to One who remembers the piety of the fathers.

Mary's eyes have looked through the Overworld, and she will tell of a fuller revelation than that of Sinai and of a victory mightier than that another Miriam sang once by the waters of the Red Sea. It is a battle not with flesh and blood, but with evil spirits in heavenly places. And the Divine Child within her has come to fulfill the prophecy given in the fifty-first chapter of *Isaias*:

Awake, awake, clothe Thee with strength,
Arm of the Eternal.

Awake, like days of old,
Ancient generations.

Art Thou not He who hewed the Proud One,
Wounding the serpent?

Though that song spoke of Egypt as the Proud One and under the figure of a Serpent, yet it contained that which could not be satisfied by even the fall of an empire. And Mary answers it, saying:

He wrought strength with His arm:
He scattered proud ones by their heart's reasoning.

The hundred and eighteenth of the Hebrew psalms had chanted:

The Eternal's right arm is being exalted:
The Eternal's right arm has wrought strength.

And in succeeding times Christian artists will carve a hand or arm

above baptismal scenes to symbolize God's power in the sacrament. But our Lady refers to that exercise of God's power described by our Lord when He said that He had beheld Satan, fallen as lightning out of the heaven. So St. Luke reports our Lord's words; and the event itself was made known to St. John also in his Patmos exile, when he saw his Apocalyptic vision of Satan, the Serpent, cast with his angels from heaven to earth and hastening to persecute the Woman and her Son.

True, in language too full and deep for any local reference, the eighty-ninth Hebrew psalm had sung:

As wounded, Thou hast broken the Proud One;
With the arm of Thy strength Thou has scattered Thy enemies.

But our Lady cannot be said to quote that passage, for the distinctive mark of her utterance is the reference to the reasoning of the heart. There in the heart, which symbolizes the centre of moral being, arise querulous objections betraying pride of intellect. We do not speak of those difficulties and inquiries which our limits in mind and experience entail, but of the will in revolt against the evidence and requirements of Divine Authority. Man's flesh rebels against man's reason, and man's reason often rebels against faith in God. In the secrecy of the heart the fool, or, more accurately, the insolent, said: "There is no God." There, too, the scribes reasoned against our Lord's power to forgive sins.

So the great Isaian ode represents a monarch as saying in his heart that he would be like the Most High; and that song in the fourteenth chapter of *Isaias*, though it referred immediately to the King of Babylon, yet had its fuller meaning in the fall of Satan, whose pride was imitated by the earthly enemy of God's people. The evil spirits in heavenly places, by the very power of their will, were fixed in enmity to God; and as was said of Noe's generation, the reasoning of their heart was evil only and always. But evil is a source of disunion, and pride is a cause of schism. Therefore, by the evil thought in the heart of His enemies God scattered them. Even though they seemed to triumph in the fall of man, God overwhelmed them by the Seed of the Woman, the Child in the bosom of her, who celebrates God's victory in her *Magnificat*.

Then our Blessed Lady speaks of the glory destined for those who shall receive the heavenly places from which angels fell in pride. She says:

He put down powerful ones from thrones,
And exalted humble ones.

And there is a fullness in the expression beyond the meaning of Anna's simple words:

Putting down
And exalting.

A great passage in the tenth chapter of *Ecclesiasticus* draws nearer our Lady's verse. But her words embrace the Overworld; and the Son of Sirach is speaking of earth when he teaches that human pride begins in apostacy from God. Then he describes the issue, adding:

The Lord has put down the thrones of rulers,
And seated meek ones in their stead.

The likeness between such expressions and those in the *Magnificat* is not shown quite plainly in the Latin version. But nothing should obscure the great difference, which also exists. And it is well to note the reference of our Lady's words to the supernatural order, else the lines which follow may be misunderstood. For Anna, the mother of Samuel, had sung:

Those filled with bread are hired;
And those hungering do so no longer.

While the barren has borne seven,
And she who has many sons is languishing.

Although such words were suitable to Anna, who had been longing for a son, they could not, in the same sense, refer to the Holy Virgin.

A psalmist had, indeed, sung of captives and exiles wandering in waterless deserts or dwelling in darkness and the shadow of death. And in the hundred and seventh of the Hebrew psalms he had told of God, how

He satisfied the eager soul,
And filled the hungering soul with good.

But when our Blessed Lady said:

Hungering ones, He filled with good things;
And rich ones, He sent away empty,

her words had a fuller meaning because of the supernatural reference, for which the previous lines and our Lady's circumstances had prepared our mind. The ancient phrases bear a more glorious burden as the prophetic flood flows onward through her soul. Her spirit, filled with God the Holy Spirit, tells of those who have been longing for God and who have felt their own need more than the hunted stag standing over the underground channels and listening to the murmur of the water beneath. Such was the singer of the forty-second among the Hebrew psalms, when he sang:

As the stag desires the water brooks,
So longs my soul for Thee, O God.

But none had known such thirst for God as Mary's pure soul, and none can know such communion with God as that enjoyed by the Mother of God. As to the rich, there have been those who rested in substitutes for the living God. Not always were the idols

of wood and stone. Often they consisted in wonderful imaginings and beautiful webs of thought. And their worshipers are unsatisfied, while God's love and glory fill those who have hungered for Him.

Of course if we omit the fact that the very fullness of the Godhead is dwelling in Mary's bosom, and if we deny that her desire for the Living God has been satisfied by His taking flesh of her flesh and forming His Most Sacred Heart from the blood of her sacred heart, there is no ground for our interpretation. But then the song not only loses all suitability to Mary's condition, but it becomes also unmeaning and a mere chaos of phrases, old and new. It falls into a worse confusion than a history which would trace the course of the first French Empire and never mention Napoleon. Those who assert that the *Magnificat* cannot refer to our Lady have never been able to suggest another to whom it can, for more than one moment, be applied. And regarding the composition and meaning of the great poem they offer suppositions mutually hostile and unable to survive a serious examination of the text.

From the summit of her gladness, from the very realm of the supernatural life, Blessed Mary looked down on the course of history, and there she saw traces of the way God's love had chosen to tread that He might prepare men for the Revelation, hidden as yet within her breast, but soon to dawn upon the world. It had been a path of gentleness surpassing a mother's love. And now, in spite of the waywardness which repaid Him, the song of His Daughter, Bride and Mother will tell the fulfillment of this prophecy which concludes the *Book of Micheas*:

Thou wilt give truth to Jacob,
Mercy to Abraham.

As Thou hast sworn to our fathers
From the days of old.

But there is a psalm, the ninety-eighth in the Hebrew numbering, which seems a fuller anticipation of Mary's triumph and Mary's hymn. It reads:

Sing a new song to the Eternal,
For He has done marvels.

There saved Him His right hand
And His holy arm.

The Eternal has made known His salvation
To the eyes of the nations.

He has revealed His justice:
He has remembered His mercy and His truth
To the house of Israel.

All the extremities of the earth have seen
The salvation of our God.

And in the forty-first chapter of *Isaias* there is a passage which may, through the Old Greek translation, have influenced the Greek

translation of our Lady's Aramaic. Rendered into English the Old Greek would run:

And thou, Israel, my servant,
Jacob, whom also I chose,
Seed of Abraham, whom I loved,
Whom I took by the hand from the ends of the earth.

The evidence of a connection is not only in the description of Israel as the servant of God, but also in the Greek verb, which is translated as "I took by the hand."

But Mary speaks of Israel's being helped, or taken by the hand, in the more intimate sense of God's Incarnation. And she tells as history what the psalmist had announced in prophecy. So she declares that God has remembered mercy to Abraham and his seed forever, just as He had promised the fathers. In her wondrous blessedness within the perfect grace of God she stands at the moment to which every succeeding age must look back. It is also the goal of long eras, starlit by law and prophecy, type and symbol. But now God has taken His people by the hand, for

He has helped Israel, His servant,
In order to remember mercy,
Such as He promised our fathers
He would show to Abraham and his seed forever.

Truly, our Lady uttered the *Magnificat*. But a larger question is suggested, and we ask to whom did St. Luke owe that gracious narrative which forms his first and second chapters, except their preface, and which contains this glorious jewel of song? To our Lady all the circumstances were known by her own experience or by her conversation with her cousins and the Bethlehem shepherds. This consideration, the indications of an eye-witness in various scenes, and the tender and simple beauty of the style, only touched with an old-world quaintness by the almost literal translation of the original Aramaic into Greek, lead us to conclude that, directly or indirectly, St. Luke derived the account from the Blessed Virgin herself.

St. Mark begins his Gospel with the preaching of the Baptist. St. John prefaces his own with the great Prologue of the Incarnate Word. St. Matthew does not speak of the Baptist till he has unrolled St. Joseph's genealogy and related visions seen by St. Joseph alone. But if the opening chapters of our First Gospel form St. Joseph's account, entrusted by him, it may be, to our Lady or to one of his nephews among the Apostles, the opening chapters of the Third form the *Gospel according to Mary* and tell of the events as she kept and pondered them in her heart. And in her *Magnificat* the expression of her triumph in God, her Son, she has given a song to every soul in whom her Son is born anew.

GEORGE S. HITCHCOCK, S. J.

THE FRENCH ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION.

TO THE New Syllabus, printed at pages 556 *et seq.* of this REVIEW, there was accorded in France such a reception as must have been generally expected, and appearance of the encyclical dated September 8, feast of Our Lady's Nativity, was by all parties hailed as a supremely important event. Universally was it felt and allowed the Pope's condemnation of what is "commonly and rightly called modernism," taught by "a large number of Catholic laymen, and—still more deplorable—by priests, from the very bosom and heart of the Church," is entitled to that attentive study it will assuredly receive throughout the cultured world. In the French Catholic press there is not one discordant note.

On the day the memorable, exhaustive, infallible document was published in Rome the *Echo de Paris* newspaper received from its correspondent there a telegram running thus, translated:

"The modernism condemned is that taught (and already proscribed in the Index) by Abbé Loisy, the ex-Jesuit Father Tyrrel, Messieurs Le Roy and de la Bertonière. At the Vatican there is a particular desire it should be pointed out that, though the Pope condemns modernism, which he considers a compendium of all heresies, the Holy Father does not intend to condemn efforts for giving Catholic action a form appropriate to actual needs of the time. The Pope rebukes, not science nor critical spirit, but their abuse by sundry learned Catholics."

"New apostolical methods are needed for the new century," writes the Archbishop of Rheims.

In a letter to his Paris clergy on the occasion of their annual August retreat Cardinal Richard told them their duty is to fight modernism with the catechism. "One of the grandest Christians of our day in youth, troubled by scientific and philosophic attack on Church doctrines, thought of looking up a well-worn little work in his library—his catechism. Once more reading pages expounding fundamental verities with the simplicity necessary for children, yet in a way adequate to the wants of developed intellects, he found doubt and disquiet depart from his mind as clouds and mists dissolve beneath the sun. What God requires from us is to teach the catechism thoroughly in the circles surrounding each one of us. Ignorance of religious truths to-day is intense, among toiling and upper classes both.¹ It will increase, owing to the programmes banishing religious teaching from schools and college courses. But it is con-

¹ Upon this read the final four lines of Mgr. Montagnini's report at page 286.

soling, encouraging, to reflect that the catechism, with its verities, responds to the needs of human intelligence, never to be satisfied until arriving at the knowledge of God. Let us then labor to make Christians who know what they believe, and we shall remake Christian society. It is an excellent plan to choose that Mass which is frequented by the largest number of men on Sunday for giving systematic courses of instruction; real, serious, catechistic teaching." Good advice, no doubt, provided the men continue to frequent that Mass and will listen to the catechist; but the crux of the situation clearly is to reach absentees from Mass, the non-practicing Catholics.²

Mgr. Péchenard says: "Anti-clericalism is a fruit of religious ignorance. Our first business is to find voluntary catechists to aid the curés."

This reminds one involuntarily of Mrs. Glasse's well-known recipe. Mgr. Bonfils, Bishop of Mans, advises his clergy to encourage the new work that is in operation satisfactorily in several towns and villages of lady catechisers of children! "How many children do not know, how many among those who do know their lessons disbelieve them? These ladies can render us valuable service."

The committee of the interdiocesan fund, composed of H. E. Cardinal Richard, the Archbishops of Rouen and Rheims, the Co-adjutor Archbishop of Cambrai and the Bishop of Versailles, met at the Paris Archbishopric on August 8 to consider the *Denier du Culte*, or worship-penny question. It had been decided by the episcopate in their general assembly to constitute an interdiocesan fund by a contribution from each diocese of five per cent. on the proceeds of its total particular *Denier du Culte*, from which fund the poorer dioceses are to receive grants in supplementary aid, the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris being empowered personally to manage the fund and distribute the moneys "personally" (though not *in propria persona*) with the least practicable delay after they are received, thus guarding against risk of sequestration by bandittee. Organizations of the worship-penny collection vary considerably in different dioceses under their respective Bishops' direction, while results most widely differ. Thus the Bishop of Amiens fixed an impost (on paper) of twenty cents annually per head, calculating the "generous" yet "somewhat mistrustful" spirit of his flock and the poverty of a proportion would render one-fourth unable, another fourth unwilling to pay its quota, but the remaining half prepared to supply the full sum requisite—an expectation found to be justified. "There are neither poor nor indifferent among that half," says His Lordship; "they have responded most nobly." The Archbishop of Cambrai's

² See M. de Bonneval's statements on page 278.

Coadjutor, Mgr. Delamaire, who requires \$200,000 yearly, says: "I am one of the highly favored among my colleagues; if my field of work is vast my priests' zeal, my flock's generosity know neither bounds nor obstacles; the worship-penny fund is in normal operation and is ample."

Experience is similar in the adjoining Archdiocese of Rheims. Mgr. Luçon says: "Voluntary subscriptions to this fund are largely sufficient in my diocese, where it has not been necessary to have recourse to any parochial 'taxation.' Last December a workingman gave a dollar; this year he has given twenty dollars from savings of his halfpence. A young widow in mourning, carrying a baby, waited upon me while I was staying, after expulsion, with Count Werle, asked for my blessing and gave me a closed envelope 'for the poor priests,' which, after some demur, I pocketed and opened later in the day, supposing it might contain a note for \$10, but found \$100. Nobody knows who she is." The Archbishop of Tours appears satisfied with the working of his worship-penny fund. In the Diocese of Beauvais, says its Bishop, "the faithful are most generous; their offerings exceed original estimates and I am without much anxiety as to the future."

The Bishop of Soissons finds "the generosity of his flock are adequate," and is likewise "not anxious." In Agen Diocese the worship-penny fund is in normal operation satisfactorily, though modifications of its machinery are required, says the Bishop. In Nantes Diocese a personal financial visitation of all his parishioners by the curé of a parish of under 1,800 souls lasting four days, ending on the Purification, enabled him to say: "Thanks to God and to the profound faith of my parishioners, contributing sums from four cents to ten dollars, I was enabled to exceed by \$60 the amount fixed by our Bishop, viz., \$430."

As a set-off to these experiences, the Bishop of Tarbes tells quite another story about the diocese made world-famous by Lourdes. His Lordship says (interviewed at Lourdes by a representative of *La Croix*): "The consequences of the separation are especially cruel in my diocese, where faith is still very lively in all places, but which incontestably is one of the poorest in France. Notwithstanding their good-will, our populations, particularly in the mountainous districts, cannot possibly contrive to provide sufficient stipends for their priests. The law inflicts a loss for last year on the diocese of nearly \$16,000, which will gradually increase until attaining the formidable amount of \$52,000 annually. Now, during this present year the general subscription opened for providing expenses of worship in the diocese totals only \$9,500. Yet in several regions we have experienced both sincere sympathy and real acts of generosity."

It is true no systematic efforts seem to have been made at Tarbes to raise the necessary funds, and the Bishop now sees the urgent need of proper organization such as exists elsewhere.

The Archbishop of Auch writes: "I am no pessimist; money will be given us, but I am in an almost solitary situation in France, with many priests for a scanty population, cruelly tried by the agrarian and viticultural crises. While throughout the country about twenty cents annually per head of population suffice for reconstituting the lost national budget of public worship in France, I am obliged to ask from my dear flock thrice as much, say sixty cents per head, if our diocesan budget is to be restored. Yet my priests are self-denying and patient; they have received nothing at all during the last six months!" In Viviers Diocese "the results of the worship-penny appeals are generally disappointing; \$100,000 will be needed next year, but only a third of that sum is wanted this year, yet the deficit in the first six months was \$3,000. Only six districts supplied the quota asked for. Not a single rich parish in the diocese furnished more than was asked."

These diverse experiences justify the warning expressed on August 8 by an episcopal member of the interdiocesan fund committee: "The first year is relatively mild. It is only now the separation is about to make its pecuniary burden felt." There can be little doubt the aggregate national *Denier* will fall considerably short of the requisite total in the second year. As time goes on that total will diminish. There will be fewer priests. *La Croix* of August 28 gave a list of about three-score in various departments who have supplemented stipends by farm, trade or artistic work, concluding it with a hope they may not find imitators, since "manual labor, if in no wise incompatible with the priest's spiritual ministry, absorbs time that would be better spent in study at the present time, when religious instruction is assailed from every side. The parish priest should have only the souls of his parishioners to think of."³

The Clermont diocesan *Semaine Religieuse* a fortnight previously observed: "Throughout the nineteenth century the Catholic clergy was chiefly recruited from the toiling population. To-day, discouraged by incessant attacks on the Church, subdued by the calumnies wherewith impiety fills the newspapers and dreading for their sons' humiliations and penury in a sublime vocation, parents now no longer foster seed Divinely sown in predestined souls, but often try to brutally stamp it down. The aristocracy and middle classes do not sufficiently realize the duty that is now imposed on them. For a century they have been the coldest, the most unsympathetic to ecclesiastical vocations. . . . Their sons have preferred to

³ Compare these remarks with page 287.

become useless, unemployed creatures of luxury; their ideal now is a racing automobile and *chauffeur's cap*."

In France the seventeenth century produced several saints from those classes. The nineteenth had but one Curé d'Ars. *Verbum sap.*

For the moment the Bishops' experiences thus far on this important matter of seminary replenishing are almost as diverse as upon the finance supply. A majority feel much misgiving, admitting fewer vocations. In Agen they have been "falling off for years." In Cambrai they "have increased." M. Edouard Drumont deplores not only upper class indifference, but "detachment of all classes from Christ. To-day indifference exists even among many who apparently remain faithful to ancestral traditions, to the outward observances of religion. If it is shown in the desolation of numerous poor village churches where only women are now to be seen, it is also evidenced by the reckless amusements indulged in by patricians of both sexes, quite regardless of the numberless unfortunates driven from their homes, obliged to fly their country, whose books and humble furniture are the prey of Jews and liquidating blocards. I visited the other day that ruined Abbey of Larchant—wondrous poem in stone, which has become a tourists' attraction—situated in an entirely hostile anti-clerical village. In the solitude I found a woman suckling her baby, who stolidly informed me: 'The curé no longer lives here. It was settled not to let the presbytery to him, and you understand nobody would give him lodging. He comes once a fortnight to say Mass.' 'Who comes to the Mass?' 'A few bourgeois in summer.' 'Then I suppose nobody brings children to baptize now?' 'Some do.' One felt as though in a Negro village and a Hottentot was speaking. Incontestably the divine sense is abolished in certain souls now; they do not need it; they suffer nothing from the absence of any ideal. Such folks are worse pagans than those in the far-off ages before St. Denis preached the Gospel to Gauls. They feel none of our woes or hopes; they are not curious about the enigmas of the world; they live an exclusively material existence. It may seem strange to ourselves there should be such people, but so it is. Indeed, in France, even among the upper classes, there are far too many Hottentots, charming ladies as well as distinguished gentlemen, who are not more troubled by the problem of the infinite than are the peasants in the country round Paris. Under courtesy of manner, grace of fascinating smiles, elegance of toilettes, there is the like soul to the souls of beings seemingly coarser. The dominant characteristic of our epoch seems to me to be indifference."⁴

⁴ Compare with the same writer's criticisms on pp. 278, 279.

M. Stanislas de Holland, after asserting Brittany is still, as ever, "the privileged land of faith and courage," goes on to admit that "the Armorican region more and more tends, invaded by new doctrines, bad journals and a sinister Masonic propaganda, to lose originality and vigor. Here, above all districts, are visible the evil effects of the accursed secularizing of education, the generation of young laity leaving school and college contrasting conspicuously with the preceding generation, remaining faithful to its pious beliefs, its traditions, its love of Brittany. It is easy to see evil progresses, irreligion spreads devastation, if one compares Brittany of to-day with the same provinces thirty years ago. The costume goes, or has already gone; the language is going, forbidden by the Masonic republic. Everywhere Masonry has emissaries quietly working to destroy old institutions, sap faith, ridicule Christian traditions. Their mission is to upset methodically, noiselessly, with geniality, slowly but surely. No corner of France is now free from the influence of the sect. The same phenomenon was remarked at the epoch of the great Revolution. Yet the Masonic conquest of Brittany is beset with difficulties. There are powers of resistance, thank God, which are not exhausted—attachment to the native soil; a faith still lively, though the moral level is gradually tending lower; the religious festivals to which Brittany keeps faithful, its pardons, Calvaries, shrines of intense melancholy, suggesting thoughts of God and maintaining in the soul those sentiments against which all the powers of evil conspire. To preserve Bretons from manifold agents of dissolution a Breton Regional Union has been formed, proposing to maintain and diffuse the language, to preserve the costumes and, generally, usages, ceremonies, festivals, as well as labor at economical development and social amelioration."

Cardinal Coullié says of Lyons Archdiocese, on the opposite side of France: "Among the sons of our staunch Catholics there are now scarcely found the firm principles, belief in pious traditions, strict educational training, respect for pastoral authority past generations so well possessed or observed."

At the Wurzburg Congress the Abbé Gasse, of Metz, insisted "to the German clergy is attributable the prosperous and relatively happy situation of German Catholics. The French clergy have kept too close within the sacristy or presbytery; parochial works, in particular for men, have not been organized. The republic is to blame certainly for the religious situation; but so was the monarchy which centralized everything; governments certainly, but likewise the clergy, including certain congregations. Every one has hitherto sought personal interest instead of the common interest, without sufficiently preoccupying himself about welfare of souls and the

honor of God." Such general criticisms are easily made. In refutation of the abbé another Metz priest, Abbé Tilly, explained that if Germans had a Volksverein, so had Frenchmen. Their "Popular Liberal Action" (see page 170) was a Volksverein, and had held splendid congresses.⁵ Parochial and social works are more numerous than is usually supposed. The rural banks of M. Durand (of Lyons) were in particular cited by the Abbé Tilly; and another priest, formerly associated with Mgr. Gibier, Bishop of Versailles, supporting this abbé, cited several other works, in particular some founded by that active, enterprising prelate. "A work of Catholic renovation is progressing in France, though of course slowly," he concluded.

Mgr. Gibier in his *Semaine Religieuse* of mid-September dwells on his cherished project of erecting in Versailles Diocese "absolutely indispensable, fresh, but inexpensive, places for worship;" foreseeing, no doubt, the sequestered cathedrals and churches of France will before very long have to be abandoned. He says: "These constructions may be portable or of cement, to hold 200, 500 or 1,000 persons, and cost \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000; easily ornamented, easily heated, easily kept in repair. Some might serve as church and parish assembly hall both. Where the flocks are small they would be better places for congregational prayer and song than the solitudes of too big a church. They should be set in the centre of the village or working class quarter. Every precaution must be taken to prevent their being, whatever may happen, robbed, confiscated, alienated from their destined uses. We know justice is not to be had for congregations, clergy or religion. Their priests should be not owners, but lessees of these buildings; owned either by legally formed civil associations or, better still, by private individuals. Ornaments, sacred vessels, etc., should not be gifts; these should be lent for church uses to the clergy."

Mgr. de Cabrières, Bishop of Montpellier, and a few other Bishops express decided opinions that from the spiritual point of view the separation law⁶ is advantageous, in spite of its causing so many enormous difficulties for the Church and heavy material losses.

⁵ Founded some three years ago, it has two thousand branches already.

⁶ Voted for by a parliamentary majority returned by one-third of the national electorate of men! It is instructive to consider how emphatically hard facts give the lie to so much of modern oratorical and journalistic clap-trap. An infallible popular dogma nobody dares deny is that, in our age of light, majorities ought to settle everything. The man in the street is firmly persuaded they really do. Yet a national minority of qualified Frenchmen (all females being debarred from voting in the Masonic up-to-date "Republic") wrecked the national Church. The idea and the *modus operandi* proceeded from an infinitely smaller minority still, viz., the Masonic international organization, which on Lady Day last declared in a

In Montpellier unwonted activity, returns to religious duties, better Sunday observance, larger male attendances in church have followed. Of Agen the Bishop, Mgr. du Vauroux, says: "Separation has improved the religious situation in my diocese." Mgr. Douais says of his (Beauvais), which reputedly was far from being the most pious in the country: "It is incontrovertible the separation has inaugurated a revival. Popular sympathy, moral influence are returning to the clergy. Among the indifferent laity respectful surprise at our attitude has succeeded to former distrust. Never before were my pastoral tours welcomed so courteously and cordially, especially by the Mayors. There never used to be such crowds to receive me. People who had believed the most dangerous of the calumnies against us—that we were rich and avaricious—now understand the falsehood, seeing that for the sake of a principle we have let ourselves be unjustly stripped of everything."

The Bishop of Quimper, admitting there are "real advantages," wisely adds: "The situation is eminently precarious." More sanguine, the Bishop of Tarbes assures us "Lourdes is our hope—the hope of French Catholics, the hope of Pius X. and, likewise, of Leo XIII., who repeatedly affirmed 'Lourdes and Montmartre, the Immaculate Virgin and the Sacred Heart will save France.' Last year about a million pilgrims visited Lourdes." It is claimed the national French pilgrimage was unprecedentedly attractive of visitors to the wonderful spectacle presented in the week ending August 24, and there were certainly a few first-class cures, mostly instantaneous in the baths. Mgr. Schœpfer hopes to celebrate next year the golden

Paris council: "If there be any deed for which Masonry can assume 'the whole responsibility,' it is the separation. If the orders of the day of our lodges are referred to, it will be seen there is not one without some inscription concerning that question. From one end of France to the other it was our perpetual watchword. If the thread of the agitation for separation is followed up, Freemasonry will be found at the beginning. This council accordingly decides to use its utmost influence in order to have erected in some Paris square a monument glorifying the separation of the churches from the State." (*Masonic Compte rendu*, 1907, pp. 62-65.) Now, France counts only one Freemason among every 1,210 individuals. There are 27,000 affiliated adherents to the Grand Orient, while the Grand Lodge only boasts of 5,100, making 32,100 Masons in the total population of 40,000,000 or so. There are besides these two Masonic "powers" wherewith France is cursed, twenty-four in the rest of Europe, fifty-eight in the United States and Canada, twenty-one in South and Central America, seven in Australia, two in Africa. William Burritt, of Pembroke, Ontario, informed one thousand delegates at the fifty-second annual session of the Canadian Grand Lodge, held this summer in Ottawa, there were over three thousand additional members gained in 1906, and that brethren in the Dominion totaled about 40,000. Mr. Aubrey White, of Toronto, reported a total of 288 lodges. The initiations last year were 3,800, the affiliations 512, against 592 resignations (withdrawals of membership) and 396 suspended for non-payment of subscriptions.

jubilee of the apparitions with an extension by the Holy See to the Universal Church of the annual Office of the Apparition—a petition for which extension some hundreds of prelates (Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops) have already signed—and also by obtaining acceptances of invitations, addressed at Pentecost with Papal approval to the world's Bishops, to organize, in correspondence with a central body at Lourdes, pilgrimages thither under direction of diocesan committees all their Lordships are begged to constitute. That acceptance generally awaits these invitations is perhaps doubtful. Our Lady's extraordinary mission seems to have been to France specially, and if so, it was rudely repulsed within the half century of miracles. Then, disturbed, dangerous, social conditions will scarcely encourage a prosperous Japanese, Antipodean, Brazilian, Mexican, Californian or Marylander to undertake such a journey, whatever Messrs. Cook may be able to do from reasonable distance of the hallowed spot, where 'marvelous spectacles, a movement in astonishing proportions,' are to be expected naturally enough if society holds together so long.

Resistance, active here, passive there, is manifested in many ways now—even, as will appear farther on, by the Magistrature. The Council General of Maine et Loire, the Council of Segré, both with unanimity, voted in identical phrase protests against the "very serious events that, by mere administration injunctions, without legislative interference, crucifixes having been removed from public schools, and Mayors, in conformity with popular desire having replaced them, such Mayors have everywhere been suspended or even deprived, thereby again violating parental rights to have their own sentiments respected by their children. Such proceedings are at once illegal, there being no law forbidding religious images in schools, and anti-democratic, for they attack popular liberties. They are unjustifiable in law and in fact." Prefectoral opposition to this protest was disregarded, while the Prefect of the Cantal has, after repeated refusals, at last sanctioned the municipality's decision to grant free his presbytery to their curé. At Leseun, in the Basque district of Basses-Pyrenees, the municipality have restored his to their curé, deprived of it (and they, consequently, of him) in April, begging the Bishop of Bayonne to send them again its rightful occupant.

In a small southern village the municipality decided to let the curé his presbytery for a dollar quarterly. Twice did the Prefect refuse ratification, and the Mayor, being unwilling to contest the matter with him, took legal advice, receiving this ingenious tip: "Put up a bill on the building, 'This House to Let,' and install the curé as caretaker. Of course, he will be entitled to be paid a proper salary for

looking after communal property!" The Prefect admired this device, which, he says, ably solves the difficulty. Owing to firmness of the Estables municipality (in Lozerè department) and that of Cré-sur-Loir (Sarthe) these questions of mayoral and municipal rights and prefectural powers of annulation will shortly be decided by the Council of State.

A customary procession on the festival of the Assumption through the city of Alençon being forbidden by the Prefect, its Municipal Council unanimously protested and congratulated the Mayor for refusing to issue such an order. The clergy invited people to assist at Benediction in the three churches, which were crowded. The function over, the faithful left, singing hymns to our Lady, proceeding to a large square fronting one of the churches, where 10,000 voices intoned "Credo." The assemblage dispersed after a benediction given from the church porch. *Corrispondenza Romana* the ensuing week highly applauded this Alençonnois demonstration against blocard power. The usual street processions on the same festival and also on that of our Lady's Nativity in Valenciennes were authorized by its radical Mayor, M. Devilliers, on the grounds that "justice requires full freedom for citizens, whatever their political or religious convictions, to manifest freely their opinions, while such liberty, to which all are entitled, could only be refused to any who would be thought likely to abuse it by disturbing public order, which is not to be anticipated in these cases, both being absolutely peaceful demonstrations, doing harm to nobody. Accordingly there is no objection to authorizing either; on the contrary, their suppression would inflict serious loss on a series of small traders, humble and modest folk, by depriving them of the means to make both ends meet." On the 15th of August, which for many years was a general French holiday, this sensibly tolerant gentleman accorded a like liberty to the city Socialists.

On the festival of the Nativity a bronze monument was inaugurated by two Under-secretaries of State at Chalons-sur-Saône, erected by public subscription to commemorate the defense of that city against the Austrians in 1814. At close of last year the Socialist group in the blocard Municipal Council resigned office, being defeated in a voting of the Council about this monument, which these Socialist Councillors insisted was too heavy a burden for the city's finances. There were consequently fresh municipal elections in January, contested by three groups of candidates, one being nominated by the "Popular Liberal Action." At the first balloting the radical list and at the second the Socialist list were defeated. The thirteen candidates of the Catholic association entered the Hotel de Ville triumphantly. The inauguration fêtes were naturally un-

paralleled for their enthusiasm and for popular decorations of the city. The clergy, associated to the general movement, celebrated a magnificent Mass for the slain soldiers at St. Vincent's Cathedral, which was crowded. Three weeks previously, at Guéret, in the Creuse, where for twenty years no liberal has succeeded in getting elected, M. Antoine Rodier, the liberal director of the local newspaper, was elected to the Municipal Council by 494 votes against 361 recorded for his Masonic opponent.

The Montparnasse Workman's Club and Patronage, confiscation of which is narrated on page 525, has been reconstituted 29 Rue de Lourmel, in the Parisian Grenelle quarter, now a populous industrial district. Thus restoration proceeds, where practicable, necessarily slowly, arduously. Any madman can quickly destroy. To rebuild an architect and capital are indispensable. So is time.

On page 284 it is recorded the Appeal Court pronounced illegal the wearing at burials of their vestments by clergymen. Several Mayors, in particular of Brest, Sens, Loupian, Villeneuve-les-Maguelonne, having forbidden such "exterior manifestations of worship," the Council of State has been applied to and has, on the contrary, pronounced, in the cases of the two submitted to it, viz., the two last named, such mayoral interdictions to be illegal. The Council of State and the Court of Cassation therefore "incoherently" interpret the law differently, and the *Parochial Echo*, of Brest (where several priests have recently been summoned for infraction of their Socialist Mayor's decree), warns the blocard municipality not to be surprised if all the local clergy "resume exercise of a right pronounced incontestable" by the highest State body as well as by the Sens Court, which acquitted the sacerdotal culprit at that place when charged.

The expelled seminarists of Lyons have been removed to the Catholic commune of Sainte Foy, where their votes will henceforth ensure a Catholic Municipal Council. It is announced a blocard Deputy, when the Chambers meet, shall submit a project of law to prevent this unforeseen catastrophe by requiring seminarists to vote at their original domicile—a fresh example, were one wanted, that Masonic "liberty" means power for freethinkers to oppress Christian thinkers. The hypocrites who used to be all for toleration of all sects are now as unanimously for thoroughgoing persecution of Catholic Christians.

So the work of methodical persecution and destruction steadily proceeds, while for the most part Catholics look on, indignantly of course, as spectators or passive resisters.

St. Nicholas' Church, in Aubusson, after three centuries' usage for public worship, was arbitrarily closed by the municipality, who

decided to have it pulled down and replaced by a covered garden for an adjoining primary school. The blocard Mayor ordered an auction sale of bells, altar, sacred images, holy water stoup and the other furniture, and solicited tenders for demolishing the ancient edifice and laying out the garden. Neither bidders nor contractors responded to his overtures.

There have been urgent prefectoral appeals to "bureaux of benevolence," to whom the law "attributes" sequestrated church properties, to come forward and claim their own. These bureaux are generally very shy of doing what sooner or later must bring hornets' nests round them. They have been episcopally warned to think once, twice and thrice before claiming (which no "law" obliges them to do) "stolen goods that in most cases would prove a source of much annoyance, litigation and expenditure." The Gordian knot has been cut by government in three cases. On September 1 decrees "attributed" to the benevolent bureaux of Paris (Charente-inférieure) and of Brive, respectively: 1. The furnished episcopal buildings and seminary, with gardens, lands and meadows thereto annexed, of La Rochelle. 2. Similar properties and book debts of \$450, confiscated at Brive. Lastly, to Evreux Hospital rente yielding \$187 yearly, with the furnished buildings and dependencies of Evreux secondary ecclesiastical school—the acquirers of these ill-gotten goods to liquidate charges on and debts of the three properties "attributed" to them. Freemasonry is adding to the language. New outlandish words are coming into use.

The Mayor of Penmarcin (Quimper Diocese) early in summer obtained a judicial order to expel the local priests from their presbytery, which was executed *manu militari* at end of August, twenty-five gendarmes assisting the special police commissary in presence of a gloomy or indifferent populace, many seeming not to understand what was being done. About the same time the sub-Prefect, special police commissary and a score of gendarmes expelled the Bishop's secretaries and other occupants from an episcopal building in St. Claude, on the opposite side of France, while (returning to Brittany) a force of 600 soldiers with 110 gendarmes enabled the police commissary to burst open barred doors and (after energetic protests by the religious) forcibly expel from their church stalls and home the Ursuline community of Vannes, who educated 300 girls of the working class. These religious have found a home in Italy and left Vannes, escorted by a sympathizing populace to the railway.

Early in September the expelled Sisters of St. Paul were accompanied to the Blois railway station by the clergy and 300 old pupils. Next day in Quimper the municipality expelled from its presbytery

the clergy of St. Corentin Church, and half an hour later the remaining Ursulines in the neighboring convent quitted it to rejoin their Sisters expelled the previous day, when the Faithful Companions of Jesus likewise quitted, under prefectoral orders, in presence of a weeping crowd, their convent in Ste. Anne d'Auray.

In the same week the nursing Sisters at Bordeaux departmental prison had to leave it for their mother house, to make way for lay infirmarians. On September 18 several brigades of gendarmerie, aided by a battalion of Thirteenth Infantry, burst the bars and broke open twenty-five locked doors of the Ursuline Convent in Blois to expel, one by one, the superior general, Mother Saint Julien, and her eighty religious, who have long conducted an important school with 300 pupils. The Blessed Sacrament was carried to another convent in the city. The nuns were escorted by 500 friends and former pupils to the Cathedral, where a ceremony of reparation was celebrated. They all then availed of hospitalities offered by numerous resident families. A few days before the Ursulines of Carhaix, near Morlaix, were in identical fashion expelled from the convent which has been theirs for three centuries.

The destroyers' own attempts to construct have egregiously failed. M. Vilatte has left France. His *alter ego*, M. Roussin (see page 181), has submitted and returned to the Church. Half a dozen schismatic worship associations provided with excommunicated priests are performing, scattered over the country; there are also a certain number unable to find clerics, and therefore practically legally non-existent. The French Protestant newspaper *Le Signal* foresaw this result; a year ago, warning its readers then of the proposed attempt, on which a good deal of money has been vainly squandered, to organize a Gallican Church independent of Rome, "is bound to fail. Genuine Catholics will obey their Pope. Catholic churches independent of the Pope were once possible. To-day they are impossible. Whether one likes it or not, the infallible Pope is everything in the Roman Church. All authority springs from that centre; to him is rendered obedience from the whole Church. You cannot be half Catholic. You are Catholic or you are not. There is no middle term."

Three or four of the schismatic groups have been declared illegal by courts of law and have had to cease operations.

When the Paris chapel in Rue Legendre was closed (see page 269) M. Duhamel, one of Vilatte's vicars, betook himself to Saint Martin du Puy, in Agen Diocese, where a schismatic worship association had been (illegally) formed, and was warmly welcomed by the Mayor, who handed him the church keys. The curé, Abbé Fonty, took proceedings forthwith to regain possession in the

Clamecy Civil Tribunal, which the first week of August gave judgment in his favor. The grounds set forth by its president are that "the curé was exercising his functions before arrival of Duhamel, who came in consequence of the Mayor's application to the central committee in Rue Legendre; that it is unquestionable the abbé is a qualified Catholic priest, while doubtful whether Duhamel, once a priest, is still one, and that there has been no legal 'disaffection' of the church requiring a change of its priest; wherefore possession must, at any rate provisionally, be left to the priest hitherto in charge, all parties being free to take ulterior proceedings; for such would seem to be the intention of the legislature, judging from the reply of the president of the commission to certain proposed amendments when article 5 of the law of January 2, 1907, was being discussed." M. Duhamel therefore lost no time in quitting the commune, greatly to popular relief and satisfaction. The attempt made at Besson (narrated on page 527) by the Prefect of the Meuse was repudiated and blamed by the Minister of Worship, M. Briand, on the ground that he was not entitled to insist upon the schismatic curé of Culey worship association officiating outside Culey Commune, where the antecedent (to December last) *Fabrique* had (schismatically) acted conformably to the separation law in time as well as deed.

On Sunday, August 11, an "ex-professor" (according to his own account) at the Perigueux Seminary, M. Constantin, was enabled by M. Poterlot, the Freemason Mayor of Stenay (Meuse department), to say a first schismatic Mass in the parish church, to the surprise of unprepared parishioners, but was on its conclusion obliged—by an uninvited escort of about 400 hostile parishioners, including small boys snatching at his long beard, others whistling and hissing, besides refusal of the travelers at the hotel to let the same roof shelter him and them—to quit the village. On the Assumption at 7 A. M. local gendarmes and others from Dun and Montmédy surrounded the church. At 9.45 a company of chasseurs was posted at the northern front. The district blocards, hurriedly convoked, began to arrive, accompanied by deriding Catholics of the various parishes, and before 10 Mgr. Maugin, dean of Stenay, escorted by the parish and neighboring clergy, with the leading Stenay Catholics, appeared in the densely thronged Place de l'Eglise. With sonorous voice the dean demanded access to his church of the Mayor, who refused it. The police prepared to clear the church portal, a military piquet moved, the police commissary laid hand on the dean, saying he had the armed force necessary to obtain respect for law, and the schismatic presented himself, surrounded by a triple row of gendarmes. He was hailed with cries, "Down with the

apostate!" "Down with Vilatte!" "Vive liberty!" "Vive the Catholic Church!" and the dean, at request of the crowd, repaired to his private oratory, windows whereof being opened, they assisted at his Mass, some 500 voices afterwards chanting "Credo," "Pater Noster" and the hymn "A Christian Soul Am I." At the sacrilegious Mass in church there assisted less than a score of men and eight females, some of whom said they went in from curiosity and that smoking was allowed. M. Constantin was reconducted away by a piquet of gendarmerie through back streets. Until noon disorder prevailed. Hostile anti-clerical cries provoked a plucky young man, finding himself alone in a group of rowdies, to draw a revolver, sight of which instantly silenced them. Directed by a lieutenant to replace it in his pocket, he did so, but held his ground several minutes, disdainfully surveying the group. There were several like instances of firm demeanor among the Stenay faithful. In the afternoon Vespers and a procession to our Lady were improvised in Madame du Verdier's park. During his triumphant return course of some 600 yards to his presbytery from that lady's chateau, Mgr. Mangin did not hear the most trifling hostile cry. M. Constantin was at once summoned by the Montmédy justices, and on the Saturday announced that he acknowledged "the Roman curé's right to say Mass simultaneously with himself in church." Next day after the schismatic function a street uproar ensued on the appearance of M. Betsch, local president of Popular Liberal Action. The succeeding Saturday, August 24, a judgment was pronounced at the Montmédy tribunal upholding Catholic rights, on the grounds that "Abbé Mangin, Catholic priest, one of the pursuers, has for seventeen years uninterruptedly until August 13, 1907, acted as curé of the Stenay church, a communal building affected to exercise of Catholic worship which has never been disaffected; that, although a worship association for conducting Catholic worship, formed at Stenay, deposited at Montmédy prefecture July 30, 1907, the declaration required by article 5 of the law of July 1, 1904, and article 18 of the law of December 9, 1905, receipt for which has been produced; and, although on August 13, 1907, M. Poterlot, Mayor of Stenay, took away from Abbé Mangin the church keys he had always kept and placed them, together with objects used for public worship, at the disposal of Abbé Constantin, the priest selected by the said association for its exercise—still it is admitted no administrative act transmitting possession of the church and the aforesaid objects to the worship association has been performed, while Abbé Mangin clearly preserved until August 13 to part de facto possession to which the law of January 2, 1907, entitled him; wherefore, it is proper, under all these circumstances, to maintain, at least provisionally, the priest

of the ancient worship and the faithful of the commune in possession of the said church and objects used for public worship, subject to the priests' contesting the matter further." The Mayor was ordered to return immediately to Mgr. Mangin the church keys; the intruder Constantin to give up instantly to the pursuers the free access to and use of the edifice "for practicing their religion." The ordonnance of judgment was to be executory, "without a minute's delay, before registration."

Evidently the president of this Montmédry tribunal is no Freemason nor friend to the sect, unlike too many in the French and English magistratures. The same evening about 7 the huissier from the court arrived in Stenay, where enthusiasm overflowed ordinary bounds, to take the keys from an ungracious Mayor and transfer them to the dean, the five bells carolling in the belfry joyously. The next morning was the patronal festival at Stenay. The church could not hold all comers to High Mass, preceded by a ceremony of reparation, altar draped in mourning, "Parce Domine" being thrice chanted; then the black coverings fell, the celebrant intoned and all present fervently chanted "Credo." Public rejoicings were most animated that Sunday; neither was there the slightest disorder. Worship associates and their Abbé Constantin kept indoors, holding their tongues. On the 29th the Mayor and municipality (unanimously minus only one vote) decided, disregarding the popular will, to lease for six years to that schismatic worship association the parish church "communal property." This decision cannot be executed to legal effect, for the law of 2 January, 1907, requires non-disaffected churches to be left at disposal of the occupants at that date. Monsieur Constantin announced by a circular No. 1 his resolve to stay in Stenay. William Constantin, born forty-seven years ago at Castellones (Lot et Garonne), the son of a policeman there, was tonsured, receiving the two first minor orders in 1884-85 at Perigueux Seminary, where he never was, neither had he ability to be, made a professor; nor did he there or elsewhere duly proceed to priesthood. He is apparently a layman in a cassock. Two months before visiting Stenay he replaced for about a fortnight another schismatic, one Travel (who was trying to extend his influence over neighboring communes) at Contréglise (Haute-Laône) for its schismatic worship association; and afterwards tried Polaincourt, where a band of women gave him a Grenoble reception, preventing his access within the church on the first Sunday, while on the second three-score men, armed with pitchforks and long whips, awaited him. Gendarmes were there and he got out of the carriage, but in spite of them in a twinkling he was putting his best leg foremost, and a regular man-chase of half a mile over the fields followed

up to the forest, into which he disappeared. A circular No. 2 fore-shadows his replacement at Stenay by "another priest." Is this due to orders from Vilatte, who possibly conferred on him sacerdotal character? Perhaps so.

The M. Tavel referred to in the last paragraph received on the Nativity an appropriate welcome at Cussey-sur-l'Ognon (Doubs), in Besançon Archdiocese, into the church of which commune the Mayor had introduced him to say a Mass, despite the curé. From the environs numerous Catholics came for Masses, celebrated (2) in open air outside the parish church profaned by the prior schismatic function. In his sermon the curé said: "Illegality and burglary must be fought. Christ armed Himself with a scourge to drive out the temple profaners. Their populations must combat *pro aris et focis*; for their altars exposed to sacrilege; for sacraments of which two, penance and marriage, were stricken with nullity; for their homes; for the dignity and honor of sons and daughters." This first Mass was celebrated in peace, nor were the hymns sung interrupted. But at the second Mass the Mayor, protected by gendarmes, after beat of drums, proclaimed "gatherings of over three persons are forbidden."⁷ A notice illegally forbidding them, and also songs and hymns, besides "seditious cries," was placarded the day before. However, the Catholic congregation remained, protecting from fresh profanation the church in front of which it was assembled. Schismatic Vespers were performed in the afternoon. During this office a band of Besançon roughs was singing the "International" outside. At 5 o'clock M. Tavel left Cussey, vowing he would not revisit it.

The curé of Beyssac (Corrèze), Abbé Faucon, expelled from church and presbytery, lives in a barn, where he says Mass, amid poverty-stricken surroundings, two planks on trestles serving for altar, a sheet for altar cloth, two phials that do not match for cruets. Chalice and paten are lent by a neighboring parish. The thatch is covered with chestnut branches. Notwithstanding such holy poverty, the barn is an impressive and superb spectacle, overflowing on Sundays and festivals with a population resisting with all its might the tyranny of a handful of municipal councillors and doing its utmost to preserve faith, for strengthening which a successful mission was begun late in August. It concluded with a torchlight procession in the surrounding woods of no less than four parishes. At this unique spot, Beyssac, there have been four schismatic ministrants for the schismatic worship association during four months or thereabouts of its existence. The first, Bellet, once Protestant, next Dominican, then married, after that remarried, introduced by the pastor Réveillaud, Deputy, presented himself arrayed

⁷ Compare this interdiction with pages 171 and 273.

in red as "a Bishop," but speedily shut up and made for Britain. The second was an aged priest who had been driven to this escapade by misery. He soon retracted to Mgr. de Tulle, the Bishop, and is actually doing penance in a monastery. The third, bringing disaster on the schism, was one Goudchiker, a Dutchman. From the outset he refused to say Mass, saying he was not a priest, though after a hasty flight from Beyssac he said three Masses successively at Beyssenae, whither he betook himself. His successor in September was one Fatôme, formerly a pupil of Abbé Coquoin, director of the Bivide Apostolic School in Manche department. Discharged from Coustances Grand Seminary, he wandered about until consecrated priest by the schismatic Swiss Bishop of Berne, after which he returned to entreat forgiveness from the Bishop of Coutances, who sent him to the Bricquebec Trappist monastery; but from Rome the Bishop was advised to restore him to lay communion and did so, a step so distasteful to himself that he offered his services to des Houx and Vilatte, who sent him to Beyssac.

On the first Sunday in September his congregation there consisted of the wife and three daughters of the Mayor. The population are, indeed, moving into the woods round the barn, putting up stores, café, etcetera, there, creating a new quarter. Church is deserted for barn.

In Agen Diocese, at St. Hilaire du Croix, last May there arrived, in company of two gendarmes, one Thers, styling himself Catholic priest, who with municipal authorization took possession of church, broke open sacristy door, installed himself in presbytery and started ecclesiastical functions, begging for funds right and left. Having begun to read regularly in the pulpit condemnations of various individuals among the clergy, he attracted notice from the local newspaper, which informs its readers the *Gazette des Tribunaux* 25 June, 1890, reports the legal prosecution of Eugène Louis Thers for illegally wearing clerical dress and swindling in the course of an irregular life, with his sentence to three months' imprisonment. The newspaper (*Avenir du Puy-de-Dôme*), inviting citizen Thers in St. Hilaire to read their account, concludes: "After doing so, citizen Thers may tell his audience whether the namesake condemned in 1890 and the schismatic curé of St. Hilaire are or not the same." He might on that occasion also say something about the edifying past of his colleague, Duc, schismatic curé of Ancizes (likewise in Agen Diocese). "He, certainly, is a priest; but, if adventures ascribed to him are substantially true, he ought to bury himself for life in the Trappist house he first entered and which he has twice quitted," says *La Croix*. On August 21 schismatic Abbé Cavalié, with two other schismatic priests, went, accompanied by Mayor and

gendarmes, to St. Hilaire parish church, the doors of which were closed and locked, a rightful occupant, Abbé Cardonne, and his faithful being inside. Calling for a locksmith, the Mayor had the sacristy door forced, thus opening a breach through which the three schismatics and their gendarmes got into the church. Abbé Cardonne declining to obey the Mayor's orders to leave it, process was drawn up and the intruders finally retired. The curé, Abbé Desliard, had previously cited Thers and the Mayor before the civil tribunal of Riom, which on the eve of the Nativity delivered a judgment in the same sense, on the same grounds, as the courts of Clamecy and Montmédy.

The administration all this time did nothing except favor the lawbreakers. It is no doubt possible the Appeal Court may reverse these judgments. Notwithstanding the last, this Mayor of St. Hilaire (who some time ago made himself notorious by a decree forbidding *any* minister of worship to set foot in a particular section of the commune) during the Octave of the Nativity actually forbade any exercise of public worship in the church that it required him to place immediately at its lawful curé's disposal!

A very considerable number of judgments adverse to the persecutors have been delivered in every district on the point raised in the Lorient case recorded in the note 7, page 275. The civil tribunal of Mans, in Normandy, alone has pronounced eight such judgments. The plaintiffs everywhere claim to have refunded to themselves as either the original donors or the legal representatives of the original donors of moneys given or bequeathed on condition that Masses should be said or educational or other trusts fulfilled for a time or in perpetuity; and those gifts or legacies were duly legalized at the proper time. These plaintiffs all say the conditions are now no longer fulfilled nor can they legally be. We are entitled, then, under the laws of all civilized States to a reimbursement. The principle involved would be admitted as sound by every court in the world. No French court could, therefore, do otherwise than admit it and find for plaintiffs. Seeing his confiscated treasures thus melting away from official coffers, M. Briand deposited a project at end of the session for arresting the flux, as mentioned at page 533. Its purpose was to disallow through fresh legislation such lawsuits by collateral heirs or universal legatees, allowing them only when brought by donors or a direct heir of the donor. Now, very many such donors were aged priests having no direct heirs, "thus the true end of the project deposited is to despoil," says the *République Française*, "representatives of donors by suppressing their rights." However, for reasons best known to himself and the author of mysteries in iniquity, the discussion was postponed, as stated in July,

until November. So many judgments according justice to suitors thereupon ensued that the Minister of Justice has tried to stem the tide by taking an unprecedented step, one that might perhaps be taken in Asiatic Turkey—the addressing a circular dated July 16, but not published for three weeks, to the chief presidents of courts and the Attorney Generals (*Procureurs Généraux*), from which the following are extracts:

“Since operation of the law of December 9, 1905, separating the churches and the State, the tribunals have had to deal with a considerable number of actions to recover, claim, revoke or annul donations or legacies made to ecclesiastical establishments subject to certain charges that can now no longer be executed. Some, brought by authors of such generosity or by their representatives, have already been decided, but the greater part are delayed by formalities of procedure and by arrears in various courts, are still pending. Now, on the 28th June last government deposited at the Bureau of the Chamber of Deputies a project of law to modify articles 6, 9, 10 and 14 of the law of December 9, 1905, introducing important simplifications of procedure, . . . but discussion of the project could not take place before close of the session. There is, however, reason to think it will be examined when the Chamber reopens.

“It seems then there would be the highest advantages gained, particularly from the point of view of diminished legal expenses, were decisions upon the cases pending before courts and tribunals postponed. I can therefore do no less than call your attention to the advantages of delaying those suits until the time when the law referred to can come into operation.

“The Guardian of the Seals, Minister of Justice,
[Signed] “ED. GUYOT-DESSAIGNE.”

Thus government dare to ask the tribunals not to try certain suits in their due order because a law is preparing to modify existing legislation affecting them! The arguments alleged in this extraordinary circular with such arrant hypocrisy were addressed to the court by counsel for the sequestrator-defendant in a suit decided early in August by the civil tribunal at Autun; but judgment was at once given against the sequestrator on the grounds that “tribunals are strictly bound to apply laws in actual vigor; and to accord the delay asked for would constitute a denial of justice such as is foreseen by Article IV. of the Civil Code.”

This Article IV. of the Civil Code quoted in the important Autun judgment runs: “A Judge who refuses to pass judgment under pretext of the silence, the obscurity or the inadequacy of the law can be prosecuted as guilty of denying justice.”

Plaintiffs in this large class of cases are doing their best to hasten

hearings. Very many suits since the circular was given to the world have been decided—all necessarily against the confiscators, who will have a heavy total to disgorge. But, mystery of Masonic iniquity! Is it not more than probable little of these moneys recovered will be redevoted to the holy souls? And is it not possible M. Briand's unaccountable postponement of a project hurriedly deposited may have been due to pressure by parties interested personally (not for those souls) in getting considerable sums out of government clutches before fresh legislation rendered that impracticable? Is money, perhaps, at the root of all evil?

Opportunately there is published (first week of October) a letter from Mgr. Herscher, Bishop of Langres, wherein this weighty question is properly dealt with *in part*:

"Spouse of the God-Man, penniless, Holy Church assuredly fears not poverty. Principles have ever been more precious to her than riches. And one must be a stranger to Catholic spirit not to approve and admire the noble attitude of Pius X., repeating, to the government offer of the Church's properties in exchange for sacrifice of her constitution, her first Pope's reply to Simon Magus: '*Pecunia tua sit tibi in perditionem.*'"

"Still, all the same, *omnia pecuniæ obediunt*, money is at least a great social power. Without it no great things are done in this world. Trustful as she was in Divine help, Saint Teresa herself acknowledged that, to found a certain convent, she required 'three ducats.' Who will insure to the French Church the 'three ducats' of the grand Carmelite reformer? Pecuniary resources are necessary for it. Necessary to provide daily bread—they ask no more—for its ministers. Necessary to reëstablish and revivify its seminaries, stripped of everything. Necessary to maintain the pomp and magnificence of public worship, which it would be a grievous step to reduce, were it only because they are powerful means of proselytizing. Necessary for maintaining teaching works; this is a moment when, Catholic schools being more than ever needed, it is out of the question to think of abandoning such work. Necessary for continuing other works of charity; service of the poor and the sick always was, always will be an integral part of Holy Church's mission. Necessary, lastly, in order to be able to maintain apostolic works; since it would be most regrettable such associations as those of Propagation of the Faith and the Holy Childhood, for examples, should, on account of what has happened in France, be deprived of means to support our missionaries.

"Who will give Holy Church these moneys necessary for thus working at the maintenance and extension of Jesus Christ's kingdom? Will French Catholics? They have already made in these

directions most praiseworthy exertions; they are preparing to make more still. But is it not to be feared their liberality, or their purse, will in the end be exhausted? Another difficulty, greater than that of indigence, is our precarious situation legally. How can we lawfully acquire or retain anything? Our very temples are not our own; we are merely occupants without juridical title. Shall we be allowed to exist thus for any length of time outside the law? And if a fresh law be made for us, what will it probably be?"

This practically minded chief pastor of an important business district avows himself "unable to join in a hymn of liberty loudly chanted to-day by some, in exitu Israel de Egypto. Certainly a few good results have followed separation—freedom for the Pope to choose Bishops; for ourselves to choose canons and curés and to communicate as we please with the Head of Catholicity. What other advantages are there? Too many Catholics, inclined to form theoretical abstract judgments in practical matters, promised more. Where is the popular indignation they said must be roused by confiscation of the Church's patrimony?⁸ Where that awakening of Catholic religious initiative they foresaw must result from suppressing what they called 'Concordat bands?' The indignation, perhaps, existed at the outset, but it did not last. I admit that by several (or by many if you prefer) it was manifested by noble movements of eloquence, sometimes even by chivalric conduct. But what about the masses? With the masses it was evanescent as a flame in burning straw. People soon get used in France to anything and everything, injustice included. And government, seeing all this, skillfully chloroformed public opinion, which fell asleep. Many Catholics, even among those personally injured by the spoliation, have now egotistically, I ought rather to say in cowardly fashion, found their account lies in keeping quiet, and if you speak to them of claims upon the brigand State, they give you, in answer, names of sons, nephews, cousins or remote kinsfolk, in State employment, reckoned in ministerial budgets, while murmuring: 'Ah, don't get me into hot water with the republic.' So much for indignation.

"As to religious initiative—who will venture to say it is now what it should be and what it was hoped it would be? How many men among us understand the truth that religion is not merely for the clergy, but is the business of all Catholics; that every one's duty is to further and promote its interests? I know there are noble exceptions to the general rule; they are but exceptions,⁹ and it must be acknowledged the separation, iniquitous as that was and is, has been far from producing such salutary movements of opinion as the

⁸ This reminds one of Ozanam's advice to the Archbishop of Paris, who, taking it, was forthwith shot.

⁹ Compare with M. de Bonneval's *elite*, on page 278.

German Kulturkampf and the union of Belgian Catholics after the voting of their wicked laws (last century).

"The fact is, looking simply, frankly at things, our present situation is the reverse of magnificent. Without material resources, without legal status—there, in half a dozen words, you have the Church's condition."

A short letter from Mgr. Belmont, Bishop of Clermont, in September concluded: "Nothing is to be hoped for excepting from the pure and simple evangelization of our populations, taking care withal to avoid preoccupations strangers to the supernatural end. Nothing could be more fatal to success than forgetfulness of the last condition."

With this Christian sentiment Mgr. Herscher unquestionably agrees unreservedly. As to his clergy, "despite municipal annoyances experienced by some and privations suffered and foreseen by all, despite the uncertain future, there is not one defection; none complain, all with their Bishop are proud to suffer something for Christ." As to his two reconstituted seminaries, students are sufficient so far in number. As to "the distant day" when, "from rupture of the Concordat, the Almighty, by the mysterious process Joseph de Maistre calls 'the alchemy of Providence,' will finally extract good, I feel strong hope the French Church shall emerge from its crisis more lively, more influential than ever. I am persuaded, with my venerated colleagues, a day shall come when the French clergy shall reëstablish the empire of our Lord Jesus Christ over souls. But that is the Promised Land. Before reaching it we must cross, not a Red Sea doubtless—for I am no believer in forecasts of a sanguinary persecution—but at least the desert; understanding thereby sufferings of all kinds."

Returning to the weighty question concerning money, all that remains to say here is the *elite* will, like Saint Teresa, always have necessary ducats provided by Providence for accomplishing His "supernatural end;" with moneys so provided evil has nought to do. A great deal more can be far better said about money by fully capable authorities, if so disposed, in the next volume.

The *Journal Official* on September 30 published a ministerial decree applying from next New Year's Day the various separation laws to Algeria, imposing on the colony all their injustice and spoliations. This involves separation from Islam, the Mahometan sacred properties having been, after conquest of Algeria, confiscated, and an undertaking then given (executed until now) to defray expenses of worship. If the decree be applied rigorously and impartially, there will be trouble and fit material for a "holy war." In any case the Catholic clergy will be in a worse situation than brethren on their European side of the Mediterranean.

There may or may not be connection between this decree of September 30 and the facts that ten days previously there had ended, after lasting a week, the Paris annual general assembly of the Grand Orient of France styled the Masonic Convent, while in that week the Grand Lodge also held its annual congress in Paris, facts that may also account for the forces employed since mid-September and the brutalities exercised at expulsions, designed probably to overawe the growing spirit of resistance which has been noted here. At a Franciscan convent near Montpellier fifteen gendarmes, with the sub-Prefect of St. Pons, unexpectedly appeared at daylight to turn out ten Sisters, one bedridden for years. On the last day of the month the curé of Nozeroy (Jura) was expelled from his presbytery by sub-Prefect and Police Commissary of St. Claude, assisted by twenty mounted gendarmes and forty on foot, with the gendarmerie captain and six sappers and miners. The brutalities over (several peaceable onlookers were struck down), the people proceeded to church for Mass, sermon and to chant "Miserere," "Parce Domine," etcetera.

As the reopening of Parliament draws nearer, more and more support is almost daily given to the hypothesis that in the September Masonic congresses a resumption of war to the bitter end was determined, and instructions were accordingly given to the brethren who ostensibly direct State policy. A special police commissary in the first week of October notified the Little Sisters of the Poor (who conduct 130 houses throughout France) that their home at Glaire (Ardennes department)—opened only in the first year of the present century—where sixteen religious care for 130 old people, must be closed. This expulsion will, doubtless, be followed by a like procedure in respect of the congregation's other French homes. Delay to sever the hair suspending until now the Damocles' sword over their inmates' heads is naturally accountable for by financial difficulty, removed to a great extent through the operation since last May of a recent law for providing municipal "assistance" to necessitous old and infirm. Probably some three thousand (more or less) Little Sisters will therefore have to look out for homes outside French territory to shelter, not their old people, but themselves, a good proportion being likewise "old and infirm." The outlook for this modern congregation is therefore serious indeed, much more so than that for expelled teaching congregations, whether new or old, or for ancient orders, whether contemplative or active.

A peril vastly more important menaces the French Church and nation in a ministerial decree by M. Briand dated July 8 radically reforming the programmes for what used to be known as the baccalaureate degree. The law of 1875 guarantees complete freedom for following the faculties in the free universities, and though no fresh

legislation to restrict it is yet announced, this decree practically repeals that law by requiring henceforth, from the November term, the frequenting one or two courses of State university instruction, and consequently amounts to a most serious direct attack on the autonomy of the Catholic faculties, hitherto legally free.

Since Michaelmas the French police and octroi officials have—"in pursuance of orders given," they regret to say—exercised, more particularly at railway stations, a surveillance, a watching, an inquisitorial questioning of former and actual religious and of ecclesiastical establishments with their *personnel*, which is inexplicable, but bodes mischief to Catholics and republicans who love liberty.

Jean Limosin (a pseudonym) relates in the *Croix de Limoges* a recent audience accorded him by Pius X. "The importance of the religious press," said the Pope, "is not even yet understood either by faithful or clergy. The elders say 'formerly' souls were saved without newspaper and press work. But 'former' times are not our times. We live to-day, when an evil press is widely diffused, when Christians are deceived, poisoned, destroyed by impious journals. In vain would you build churches, preach missions, found schools; all your efforts, all your good works would be defeated should you not simultaneously wield the defensive and offensive arm of the press, Catholic, loyal, sincere."¹⁰ Says the interviewer: "The Pope became animated; he shrugged his shoulders compassionately, his eyes flashed and I called to mind what he did when Patriarch of Venice to maintain his journal *Difesa*, of which he said: 'If other resources fail I would sell my pectoral cross rather than let this necessary work succumb.' Speaking of the actual situation, the Holy Father said: 'The French clergy must prepare for enduring worse things. The persecution is only beginning. Doubtless it will become more violent. Priests will have to suffer absolute misery. But I place confidence in them; I know they are brave. In the seminaries they received sound doctrine and a truly supernatural formation of character. Let them be united, helping each other, sharing available resources.'"

J. F. BOYD.

¹⁰ Last Easter Pius X. sent this autograph, printed in a special edition of the Naples *Croce*: "In face of unrestrained license of the anti-Catholic press, which impugns or denies eternal laws of truth and justice, which stirs up hatred against the Church, which insinuates into people's hearts most pernicious doctrines, corrupting minds, fostering evil appetites, flattering the senses and perverting the will—all ought to recognize the great importance of union between good people for turning to advantage of the Church and society a weapon the enemy uses to injure both. We have, therefore, only the highest praise for Catholic writers who strive to oppose the antidote of the good press to the poison of the bad press, and, that they may not lose courage amid the labors, trials and difficulties inseparable from all good works, we bestow upon all of them our blessing, that the Lord may support them in the good fight and pour out upon them abundant heavenly assistance."

LOSS AND GAIN IN FRANCE.

THE new developments of the religious question in France since the fateful month of December, 1906, are important enough to claim attentive consideration. The law by which the divorce of State and Church was pronounced has been in operation—at least as far as the decision of the Pope has allowed it to be in operation—for about one year. The momentous changes effected by the law and the circumstances that attended its execution are now felt. The crisis is on us, and although we are yet in its commencement, we have receded far enough from the very beginning to take a survey of our positions. It will not be without interest to compute as exactly as possible the losses and gains of the Church of France during the first year of the separation; to ascertain what belongs to the debit or the credit side in our account and draw our balance-sheet before turning a new leaf of the ledger.

The separationists of fifty years ago compressed their doctrine into these few words: a free Church in a free State. That the politicians who framed the separation law had not this ideal in their minds is well known to all American Catholics and needs no demonstration in this REVIEW. To withdraw the money, not to grant liberty, was their end; the priests would cease to be paid, but they were not to be left untrammelled. Our republican statesmen are too much afraid of the power of the Church to allow it a free hand; too much imbued with the old French doctrine of State ascendancy and State universal interference to give up meddling with religious affairs.

Yet, if we look at the situation exclusively from this point of view of liberty, owing partly to some provisions of the law itself, partly to the action of the Pope which nullified a great part of the other dispositions, we may say that nothing but gains, up to the present, have to be registered.

The law has given us three important liberties:

The nomination of the Bishops is no longer in the hands of the State, and this is evidently a great gain. There was a time when the State was represented by believers; even then their influence did not always tell for good, but they might be expected to have some consideration for the welfare of the Church; and there was a time when the Ministers were indeed unbelievers, but viewed the Church in the light of a beneficial influence, whose advantage they studied whilst trying at the same time to shorten what they might call its political tentacles; but now all the Ministries are composed of bitter foes, who consider the Church as a noxious power, a stumbling-block

on the way to intellectual and social progress, an antiquated institution which, being incapable of improvement, ought to be suppressed as soon as public opinion will allow it.

Was it reasonable that such men should be entrusted with the care of selecting the pastors of the Church? The evil was circumscribed by the necessity of securing the Papal assent. Yet, in the diplomatic battles that were fought over each episcopal election, the French Minister had manifestly not the interest of religion in his eye. This absurdity has been done away with. The system of presentation is not yet officially regulated as in America or England, but at least we know that those selected are chosen for the best of religious interests.

A second liberty granted by the law is the right for the Bishops of assembling together and holding councils. It may seem strange to American citizens, but this right did not exist in republican France till two years ago. In the middle of the past century provincial councils had been tolerated; but when the anti-clerical party got into power they forbade those assemblies altogether, and went so far once as to lay an interdiction upon a pilgrimage in which several Bishops were to take part as being a council in disguise. Those obsolete regulations have disappeared, and Paris has witnessed twice a sight that had not been seen in our country since the Revolution—a meeting of the whole French episcopate. In the fine historical mansion of La Muette the seventy and odd prelates were allowed to hold their sessions and to discuss undisturbed the questions arising from the present crisis.

The third liberty is this: It is lawful to anybody to open as many private chapels as he likes on his own premises, without asking leave of the government. This was prohibited till now, even if your private sanctuary was for your own use, although the interdiction was not enforced in all cases. We have still in our memory the Châteaouvillain affair, and the death of a young working girl shot by a *gendarme*, when the public force broke into a factory to close a private chapel situated on the grounds, which did not even open on the public road.

Sometimes this prohibition was pushed to the last limits of absurdity. The Collège Stanislas is the largest and most famous of the Catholic secondary schools of Paris. Some years ago its two chapels were closed by order of the government; some thousand boys that lived in a house with two chapels inside could not use them, but had to go to the parish church, already crowded with worshipers; nevertheless, at the same time all the *lycées* of the State were provided with a chapel, a chaplain and offices which the boarders attended, thus enjoying a religious privilege denied to a Catholic

establishment. On the 1st of January, 1906, when the separation law went into force, without asking for any authorization, the seals were broken, the doors opened and Mass said in the two chapels and divine service has been celebrated there uninterruptedly since that time. This new liberty may be of much use in the future if the clergy are obliged to leave the churches.

By the side of these liberal provisions, many of a contrary nature were to be found in the law. The priests were liable to be fined and imprisoned for words pronounced in the pulpit. The *associations cultuelles*, that were to be formed nobody knows exactly how, by the voluntary aggregation of individuals, without any authority to decide who was to be admitted and who to be excluded, so that they might have been composed of anti-Catholics—the *associations cultuelles* were to rule over ecclesiastical matters; for the funds were at their disposal, and they were not obliged, except by a very vague and ambiguous clause that might be interpreted any way, to submit to the Bishop. Although powerful in the Church, these same associations were fettered on all the other sides; they did not enjoy the rights of the non-religious associations as determined by the law of 1901; there was a special legislation for them; in the same way the religious orders had been excepted, on account of their character, from the liberty granted to all kinds of societies, as if religion in France could never be submitted to common law, but was always bound to experience the privilege of special favor or special rigor. The owning capacity of the associations was strictly limited to prevent them from accumulating treasures and keep them weak and dependent.

All this fabric of the law fell to the ground when the Pope refused to recognize the *associations cultuelles*. In the confusion that ensued it might have been a strong temptation for the government to proceed with a high hand. But they were clear-sighted; they realized that violence would rouse the feelings of the faithful and give new life to a religion they wanted to destroy. The President of the Cabinet owned publicly that they were in the midst of confusion; but, instead of getting lost in it, they threaded the mazes of that confusion with the utmost skill. They were not logical, but they showed a practical ability to which the madmen of the Combes Ministry would certainly have been strangers. Their purpose was to keep the churches open and the worship free, while the despoiling was going on, so that the people might not notice any difference. They discovered first that the law of public meetings might be applied to religious services, which could be lawfully celebrated as such; but a declaration to the police was necessary to make them legal; the priests gave passive resistance, did not make any declaration and

waited for the result. On the first two days legal proceedings were started for every Mass said; but the absurdity of repeating this fifty thousand times every day soon became obvious. Then a law was passed to suppress the necessity of the declaration for any gathering, religious or not, and in this incidental way France was given the absolute liberty of public meetings. The priest was left in his church, although he had no legal title to it, and care was taken that peace should be preserved there, on what legal grounds is not apparent. This is something like juggling with the law, but it must be confessed that the juggling was cleverly done.

To sum up, we have gained some liberties and we have lost none, at least up to the present; for it should not be forgotten that this extra-legal situation is extremely precarious. But till now, except in a few cases, the churches have remained open, all seems to be going on as formerly; the services are celebrated and not interrupted; since the foolish prosecutions for saying Mass have been dropped, no priest has been prosecuted for what he has done in a church, except a Bishop who was condemned for celebrating a marriage before the civil ceremony was performed. A casual observer might conclude that nothing is changed. But this consideration of external liberty is not the only side of the question.

It is impossible to enjoy liberty without having means to live. Thus the property question springs up, being closely linked with the other, and on this point we have nothing but losses to register.

Who was to be the owner of the churches after the separation? They have been built for Catholic purposes with Catholic money, aided by State contributions. It is easy to see how many considerations might be brought into the discussion of this point: Is there no distinction to be made between the old churches, already confiscated at the time of the Revolution, and new ones built by donors who generally did not mean to make a present to the State? In what degree do the contributions of the State give it a vote on the subject or entitle it to claim its money back? Is it not an absurdity that, after the separation, a theoretically and even practically atheistic State should own all the edifices in which public worship is conducted? But, in fact, there was no discussion, only a declaration by the government that they are ours; we cannot allow them, said the government, not to be our property, renewing the reasoning of a famous robber on the French stage, who, finding a trunk full of valuables, says to his band: "This trunk *ought* to be ours; *ergo*, it is ours;" or of the lion in the fable, saying: "This portion is mine, for if anybody touches it I will strangle him."

So it happened that churches that have been built in recent years from the foundation to the roof with the money of pious Catholics,

and to which the State has not contributed a farthing, are declared, when completed, to be the property, not of the builders, not of the donors, not of the institution for whose benefit they were intended, but of the State, which has done nothing but to look on. In the other cases there may be discussion; distinctions may be made, but this is certainly downright confiscation.

It should be noticed that this happened independently of any action of the Pope. Even if the Pope had accepted the law, all the churches were declared to be the property of the State, or the *commune*, which is nothing but a branch of the State. The case was this: If you build a church on your own ground with your own money, you could keep your property if, with an authorization, only private worship was performed in it; if you threw it open to the public, you had to make it over to the *fabrique*—that is, to the parish considered as legally entitled to ownership; it became a parish church, and all parish churches were, when the law was passed, considered by our legislators as belonging to the commune or to the State. By this roundabout way the confiscation was done without giving the transaction its true name.

These edifices were to have been let out to the associations for a formal rent of one franc. This was made impossible by the decision of the Pope, and yet the government would by no means close the churches; so the most absurd of situations has developed. The priest is still in the church, but as an *occupant sans titre*, a delightful formula which means that he is there, but has no title to be there. He has not been expelled, because it was not found convenient; but he may be expelled at will without any recourse at law. He has no right to the vestments, the vases, the furniture, and yet he is left the use of them; it is out of his power to impose taxes on seats, on the use of the organ, on special decorations at weddings and funerals, but he may receive free offerings upon those occasions, and, of course, say what the free offering should be if such extra service is expected. All this is topsy-turvy, but seems likely to last still some time, and may be said to go on without too much friction. Yet it is not a lasting system, and will be wrecked on the question of repairs. The *occupant sans titre* cannot be expected to undertake the repairs of a big church, and has even no right to do so, and many *communes* have no wish to see this burden laid on their shoulders.

The presbyteries have been considered for a long time as being the property of the *commune*, except a few which were private property and have remained so. The municipal councils, that are the ruling authority in each *commune*, are allowed to let them out to the priests, who occupied them free of rent before, or to appropriate them to any usages they think fit. This has been used as a weapon

against the priests who were unpopular in their parish. The council could not expel them from the church, which is not to be used for non-religious purposes; but they could close the door of the presbytery in their face, and in small villages there was not always another house to let. But, in fact, this has been exceptional. In the majority of cases the councils allowed the priest to remain in the presbytery on condition that he would pay a moderate rent, which was afterwards thought too low and raised by the government.

After the church, the school is the great asset of religious influence in a country. On this account our balance books show a most lamentable deficit of late years. Our losses are considerable, not so much as an effect of the separation as of the dispersion of the religious orders and the furious war that has been raging against religion all over the land for about ten years.

All members of congregations were forbidden to teach. As a consequence, all the schools that were in their hands have been closed, except a few which the same fate is awaiting. It does not mean that they are all closed now. Many have been reopened with secular or secularized teachers. But the situation is very different from what it was before the storm broke out. A large number of schools have simply disappeared. Where secular teachers were employed to replace religious communities there was experienced a great difficulty in finding able men and women, and during the hesitating period of transition, yielding to official pressure, many children slipped away to the government schools and never came back.

By means of secularization a large body of teachers was made available, out of which the needs of many schools were supplied. But this system is not without its disadvantages; persons brought up to live in a community, and especially women accustomed to the atmosphere of a convent, were not always found well prepared for the new conditions. But the greatest difficulty is the recruiting problem. A religious order is a self-sufficient body; it attracts and absorbs novices and, by a sort of digestive process, converts them into its flesh and blood. But when its elements have been scattered like dust, how are they to be renewed as they drop away through disease, old age and death? This problem is engaging the minds of zealous Catholics, who think of establishing training schools. But another difficulty faces them, and that is the want of money. It is a grand project to form a large body of lay Catholic teachers, provided with their certificates, prepared by a thorough training to compete with the best men of the State schools, learned, open-minded and able; it is a vast and bright prospect, but it would cost such an amount of money, not only to get them, but still more to maintain

them! Congregations are cheap; the vows of celibacy and poverty and living in common reduce the expenses of their members to more than half what they would be in the world.

To attempt to solve this problem all at once would be impossible in the present state of France. But there are interesting attempts made here and there, especially to provide female teachers for the girls of the middle and higher classes, who were educated in the convents when convents existed and have remained generally in the Catholic schools opened in their places. Those efforts, as, for instance, the preparation for the higher university degrees, will contribute to raise the intellectual level of the teaching. Care must be taken that the religious influence which should pervade education does not diminish proportionately.

So much for the primary schools. As for secondary institutions, they have suffered much and are threatened with hard regulations and perhaps destruction. They have suffered much, not only because those belonging to the religious orders have been closed and reopened with a *personnel* hastily formed, but also on account of the prevalent state of opinion and the fears of Catholic parents. The wind that blows in France now does not drive boys and young men to the gates of our colleges. We shall speak further on of the seminaries (clerical schools) and their dwindling numbers. The parents who prepare their boys for a secular career know very well that if they send them to a college under the management of priests they saddle them with a burden for life. They will not be stopped at the entrance, it is true; they will pass as easily as any through that gate of State examinations which leads to every liberal occupation in France; for it should be said to the honor of the State University that its professors are most fair-minded, and although the greatest number of them are unbelievers, they make no exception of persons and never—or hardly ever—inquire about your faith to test your capacity in chemistry or the classical languages. But in after life the young pupil of the priests will be handicapped in many ways, especially if he has got one of the numerous berths of officialdom. He shall be very lucky or very able if he contrives to rise to a high position without disowning his masters. This explains how and why some of the bitterest enemies of the Church are those that have been brought up by the priests. They want to wipe out by vigorous rubbing the story that sticks to them in the eyes of their companions.

It was not so—or not in the same degree—ten years ago. The parents know the present state of things and see the clouds thickening more and more over the heads of their children, and some lose heart. They send their boys to the *lycées* (State secondary schools), and try to counterbalance by the influence of a Catholic home the

bane of an agnostic teaching and the society of irreligious boys. For that reason and some others the population of the Catholic colleges has been diminishing.

It is now a question whether they will still exist next year. A law is in preparation upon or rather against free secondary education. The project of the government is only to regulate it, by hard rules, it is true, and which would open the way to much arbitrary action; yet if the law passed such as M. Briand, the Minister, framed it, the Catholic colleges would not disappear, or not all at once. But the committee of members of Parliament to which the preparation of the law is entrusted go much further. They propose to forbid any minister of any religious persuasion to teach. As there are very few Protestant ecclesiastics and still fewer Jewish rabbis engaged in teaching, this sweeping interdiction would be, in fact, restricted to the Catholic clergy.

The men of the committee are logical. The members of the religious orders were forbidden to teach because their minds are obnubilated by dogmas. Not less obnubilated is the mind of the priest; a step further should be taken, for the believing layman is obnubilated, too, and a teacher should be obliged to swear that he does not believe in Christ before he ascends his chair. It may come to this; but it is not yet in sight. But there is certainly a tendency everywhere in France to establish a kind of negative State orthodoxy, that is, the State expects you or requires you not to be a believer. You may believe what you like, but not the Christian religion. Anyhow, whether the Minister or the committee prevail, the law will probably be a hard blow dealt to the Catholic colleges.

It is known to all the world that the material loss incurred by the Church in December, 1906, was enormous. It has been a wholesale confiscation of real property and money.

The suppression of the treatment allotted by the State to the parish priests was a confiscation; this treatment was an indemnification for the property taken during the revolution. Of course, the property has not been given back; the indemnification has been taken away in its turn, so that what formerly belonged to ecclesiastical institutions is all now on the side of the State and nothing on the side of the Church. It has taken a century to pick the bone, but it is picked very clean now, or at least will be in a few years; for the priests still enjoy a few crumbs of the old *budget des cultes* in the way of pensions and allowances.

This suppression was in the law, whatever the Pope might say or do. It was different with the property of the Church acquired since the great confiscation. This was to devolve on the famous *associations cultuelles*; it was the bait carefully concealed inside the law,

which was presented to the Catholics with this argument: "If you form associations, you keep all your church property, which is worth so many millions; if you do not form them—well—you do not keep it."

It is quite true that the government was not bent upon confiscation; it relied upon the strength of the dilemma. Imbued with this idea, that no consideration is ever higher than money in the Catholic Church, they felt sure such an amount of money could not be thrown away for the sake of principles. But the decision came from Rome that no associations ought to be formed, and the government could not but confiscate. The fault was to have placed the Catholics in such a dilemma, which was tantamount to saying: "You ought to have *my* conception of the Church; if you have not *mine*, I take away your property from you."

What has been lost? There were two kinds of ecclesiastical property, because there were two institutions capable of ownership—the parish and the diocese. To the diocese belonged the buildings of many seminaries, foundations for their maintenance, pension funds, asylums for aged priests and some estates; to the parish, foundations for Masses, sometimes investments, lands, etc.

All this has been swept away. All the seminaries have been closed, first, because a seminary was an institution that could no longer exist under the new law, and secondly, because their buildings were taken from them. Some of these edifices—it was the case of many *grands séminaires*—had always belonged to the State; of course it was no confiscation to take them back. But a greater number—it was the case of nearly all the *petits séminaires*—belonged to the diocese; the State had not contributed to their purchase, building or maintenance. These were not taken back, but taken away from us.

In the middle of December the students had to be sent to their families, the professors dispersed and guardians were established in the empty premises, where the chapels remained vacant and the altars stripped to the stone. Many movables were carried away by the true owners, although this action was threatened with prosecution, which never took effect. Sometimes resistance was organized; the dispersion was then delayed for a time and afterwards effected by force. At Beaupréau a severe collision took place between the military and the Catholics and several persons were wounded on each side. However, as a rule, the order of dispersion was mournfully but peacefully submitted to and the work of reconstruction began at once.

That seminaries were not allowed to exist under the new régime was no formidable obstacle. It meant only that the legislation

special to those houses was no longer in existence, and that they were obliged to conform to common law. The *grands séminaires* were transformed into higher schools of theology under the provisions of the law of 1876, the *petits séminaires* into secondary colleges according to the regulations of the law of 1890. This is not a mere quibble, for the conditions are not the same; yet they are tolerable; one may live under them pending the new education law, that may destroy all our reconstructions.

The want of suitable buildings was a much greater trouble. Sometimes a seminary was separated into two or three sections. It is not easy to find a college ready made. The convents vacated by their inmates four or five years ago were a great resource. But it required money to buy them or take them on lease.

The use of several buildings has been preserved by the means of leases. For instance, the Catholic University of Paris rents an old convent that belonged to the *Bureau des Séminaires*, in fact, to the diocese. In December last that bureau ceased to exist and the building was put under sequestration; but the lease had to be respected, and the university remains there till it runs out. This was an old, manifestly bona fide lease; some were concluded a few months or a few weeks before the law took effect. Till now there have been threatenings, but no proceedings against them.

Most of the seminaries are reconstituted, but they show the scars of the wounds they received in the battle. The number of students has diminished, to a fearful extent in some dioceses. A mere handful remains in the less religious parts of the country. The Dioceses of Troyes and Sens have joined their two handfuls and decided to have only one grand séminaire at Troyes and one petit séminaire at Sens, and these institutions will be far from crowded. In the present uncertainty of things parents will oppose the vocations of their sons, and the priests themselves do not care to lead boys into this road till they see a clearer way out. It seems as if the sources of recruiting were to be dried up. But this is not to be feared; things will settle in time, and, meanwhile, if there is a diminution in the number of priests, it cannot be regarded as an unmixed evil; for it will be difficult to maintain a great many, and in the active life that is opening for them alertness will count for more than number.

All the foundations, investments of money, various sources of income and pension funds have been confiscated, or, more exactly, have ceased to be owned by anybody, which for the Church is practically the same thing. What will become of them? The present situation seems to be an inextricable tangle. Many donations are claimed back by the families of the donors and their suits are pending before the tribunals. Will the government procure the saying

of Masses? Yes and no have been alternately the answer. To take the money without fulfilling the obligations would seem—I shall not say unjust; that would be nothing—but contrary to the popular feeling of respect for the dead. But to see the Government of France distributing Masses among the priests would be an amusing spectacle. All this property cannot remain indefinitely without an owner. To solve this difficulty, which came unforeseen upon them, the Ministers prepared a new law—they are building up quite a Babel tower of laws. According to their project, this property will revert either to the department, or to the commune, or to a public charitable institution, or to a public educational establishment, according to the decision of the central government. In all this entanglement of decrees, laws and lawsuits one thing is clear—the money is lost.

If we remember the vast amount of real property that has been taken from the religious orders in 1901; if we add all the edifices and sums of money that the Church has lost in December, 1906, we shall realize that no confiscation has been made in any country on such a large scale for a long time. Perhaps not since the great Revolution has so much property undergone that process of changing hands without compensation and against the will of the owner, which is called robbery when performed by private persons. This plunder does not enrich the State; it melts away somehow. It was promised that the so-called *milliard* of the congregations would serve to establish old age pensions. Not a penny of it has been appropriated to that purpose; it has evaporated; what has become or is becoming of it is a riddle not easy to solve. Of course, all was not lost for everybody; but all was lost for the aged workers.

Now, what is being constructed on these ruins? We are as yet feeling our way, making attempts in several directions, trying to find out what is the best in the present circumstances.

The most pressing problem is how to procure a decent living for the priests and defray the expense of the church, and it will become still more and more pressing, as the younger priests, who are in receipt of small allocations from the government, will cease to receive them in three years, and the older ones, who are entitled to a pension for life, will die out. The remnants of the *budget des cultes* will flow in a thinner and thinner stream till they are reduced to mere dribblings and then vanish altogether.

In the towns the clergy will be supported by the people. In the villages the case may be different. Some, with the example of St. Paul in their minds, have contended that it would be best for the priest to live by the labor of his hands, and a not inconsiderable number of village curés have acted on this principle. There are workshops in some presbyteries. I know a priest who has a printing

plant in his house; another who is an organ and harmonium maker. A large garden, when well cultivated, is a source of income. I have heard of a priest living on the edge of a forest who owns a large number of beehives and lives, so to say, on honey. These are only individual ventures which are much discussed, and good reasons are brought on both sides. The great advantages of the system would be to secure independence to the priest and screen him from the reproach of idleness in countries where the religious conditions are such that he has nothing to do in the church; the drawbacks, that sometimes it would bring him into commercial competition with his parishioners, would foster the love of gain and tend to materialize his life. Perhaps it would be possible to obviate this by instituting, say in the market towns, self-supporting communities, where some hours would be set apart every day and work performed in common for distant employers, such as printing for the great Paris houses, and from which the priests would sally forth when useful or necessary, and minister to the spiritual needs of the neighboring villages. But those groups as yet are only talked of, and this system is too different from what exists now to be introduced at once.

The chief effort has been the tentative organization of what is called the *Denier du culte*, i. e., the collecting of voluntary gifts that are centralized into the hands of the Bishop and then distributed to the priests. The idea is that not the parish, but the diocese should be self-supporting, so that the rich parishes could make up for the insufficient yield of the poor ones. Collections have been made in churches for that purpose and door-to-door collections have been added.

These last have occasioned much trouble to the village priests in some parts. In England and America the collectors go round the Catholic houses and pass by the Protestant homes; in France everybody is supposed to be a Catholic, which often he is not. When the priests were enjoined, as was done in many dioceses, by their Bishop to go personally and visit all the houses in their parish to collect money for the diocesan fund, it meant that they had to go even to their most bitter opponents and ask them for money for the maintenance of an institution which they think it their duty to destroy. I know that this has been a severe ordeal for many. The stubborn silence preserved in some houses when the subject was broached, the hints and taunts about idleness the priest had to put up with, the answers, absurd to the limits of idiocy, he got sometimes—it was not very uncommon for peasants to tell him this money was intended to favor a German invasion of France—put a severe strain upon the patience of the poor collector. But on the whole this strange kind of parochial visitation has very likely done more good than

harm. A disagreeable contact may be better than no contact at all.

The results have been surprising, deceiving all expectations one way or the other. Regions where hardly anybody goes to church on Sundays have given freely; those people want to have their priest to baptize their children, assist at their weddings and officiate at their funerals, in a word, to perform their family rites; for all that remains of religion in those parts is a kind of family worship. Other dioceses, where the churches are full and nearly everybody is a communicant, have made scanty offerings. It should be added that the former regions are rich, the latter poor; but the strangeness of the fact remains.

On the whole, the prospect is not encouraging. It is reckoned that for the first year people have given more than they intend to give in after times, and that their charity will slacken; yet there will be more and more need of it. With years it would not be very difficult to constitute again a kind of patrimony of the diocese or the parish by means of bequests and gifts, if there was somebody to possess them. What is badly wanted is a system of collective ownership to secure continuance of possession and inspire the donors with confidence. The *associations cultuelles* were endowed with the right of owning small and quite insufficient sums; they have been forbidden, and till now there is nothing in their place. The Archbishop of Bordeaux and the Bishop of Chartres have tried to form a diocesan association that was not to be *cultuelle*, constituted according to the law of 1901 and intended to be the legal owner of the collected funds, but it was at the time when so much noise was made about the refusal of the Pope; Rome feared there might be some confusion in the public mind about the two kinds of associations, and the Cardinal Secretary of State wired to the Bishops to suspend everything pending further instructions.

At the present time the considerable sums centralized in the episcopal towns are owned by nobody, and as a consequence are legally the property of the man in whose house they are found; if in a bank, of the man in whose name they have been deposited. If he dies without having made his will, this money descends to his heirs; if he has made his will, this may be canceled by a tribunal if not made in due form. Recent examples of money collected for the building of a church and now being squandered away by the unscrupulous relatives of a dead priest may well perplex the mind of the collectors and cool the generosity of the donors.

Would it be possible to form associations on a foreign soil, say in England, according to the English law, which associations would be the owners and managers of the patrimony of the Church in France? There are many financial societies which have their assets

in foreign countries. Only legal men can discuss this question. To an outsider, if the thing is feasible, several advantages become manifest. The owning capacity of those societies would not be limited like that of the *associations cultuelles*; they would be out of reach of the new laws which the French State would not fail to make if the Church regained some property; people would give more willingly if they knew how their money is managed and that it is not liable to a fresh confiscation. The Bishops and their legal advisers will certainly consider this aspect of the question.

One way or the other, some means of guaranteeing the collective property of the Church must be devised. As in the sacred edifices the priest cannot remain eternally an *occupant sans titre*, so, concerning the sums that are necessary to the maintenance of worship, he cannot remain a long time a *possédant sans titre*.

But the most important question of all is not the material situation of the priests; they will manage somehow, although with difficulties, to keep soul and body together. But what about the souls themselves? What is the present state of religion? Is there any change? Are there losses or gains since the separation has been effected?

We are here on disputable ground. It is pretty easy to determine whether liberties have been acquired or lost, still easier to become acquainted with material losses; but when it comes to the state of the souls, there is no instrument delicate enough to ascertain with exactitude the pulse of religious life. We must fall back upon the more or less reliable observations of individuals. The statements I venture upon here must be taken as such and as subject to revision in the future.

The readjusting of an old system to a new order of things cannot proceed without much creaking, straining and breaking until all things fall into their proper place. During that confusing process it is very difficult to judge of the result. Some symptoms appear very alarming, some raise great expectations and both may be deceptive. The diminution of clerical students in seminaries, for instance, seems to threaten the very existence of the clergy. But this may be remedied in time, when the elements now disturbed and tossed about by the present storm crystallize and settle into a permanent organization.

Among the clergy, especially the younger priests, there seems to be an outburst of fresh activities. In the industrial towns some have chosen the poorest quarters and established there meeting halls for boys, young men and old men. They attract, indeed, a small number in comparison with the crowds that remain outside, but they are intimately connected with their people; they know them, love them and are loved by them. Out of those popular groups have

grown new parishes which may be expected to be a ferment of religious life amongst the dense masses which no light from heaven ever pierces. These new parishes are not founded on the old idea of the superior station and dignity of the priest, directing his flock from the height to which his priesthood elevated him, but on the new idea of the priest mixing with the people, being one of them, playing with them and making them acknowledge his superiority by a devoted life, the only ground admitted for it in an incredulous world.

Even in the country there are priests who waken up and try new forms of apostolate, such as agricultural syndicates, lectures out of the church, lantern views, etc. These are only individual instances; nothing is systematized; but, on the whole, it points in a right direction. Everybody that wants to be useful feels that something new is wanted. The Bishop of Versailles, one of the pioneers of the movement, anticipating the time when his priests will have to leave the churches, sent to them the startling announcement that they would do well to provide themselves with wooden sheds as portable meeting halls, proportionate in dimensions to the number of those who really come to Mass. The priest, he said, would be nearer his congregation; he could talk to them, and not preach; the meeting would not be so formal and so cold as in a large empty church, with a few straggling persons scattered here and there in the pews. The air is full of new ideas and suggestions. They may not be all the product of common sense; they may also be very good, but remain suggestions. Yet they prove at least that the minds are astir, and what is stirring is not dead.

As for the laity, I must say that no perceptible change is noticed. Yes, we hear at every great feast that the churches have never been so crowded; we hear every year that the number of communicants has increased since last Easter. But I have heard it for years and years, and if it was true, religion would have made wonderful progress, which it has not. In fact, this is noticed only in big towns, and is easily explained by the general increase of the population. In many parts of the country the churches have become more and more empty, the priest more and more solitary, and there has been no change this year.

No reliance, I think, should be placed on the assertions of peasants to casual visitors whom they want to please saying they did not know their votes would have such consequences; they have been deceived, but now their eyes are open and they are ready to raise their voices against the enemies of their religion. I have seen the letters of an English family spending the summer months in Auvergn and persuaded that the peasantry of those mountains were ready

to hurl their ballots at the head of the government. My own opinion is that if there was a general election to-morrow the results would be the same as in the last one.

The process of religious disintegration is going on in the best parts of France, especially in Brittany, which is altering rapidly. A great part of the maritime population of this province is lost. One of the causes is the great length of time they remain in the fleet, when they come under baneful influences. The agricultural population makes a better stand; but among them also religion is losing ground.

The sacrifice of so many millions for conscience' sake joyfully undergone by the French clergy was indeed a great example. It has been lost upon a materialized nation; it has caused a momentary stupor—was it possible? Now it is forgotten.

The progress of indifference and anti-clericalism has not been stopped. Those forces are still making headway among the masses. A widely read press continues to be hostile to religion, although its tone is more or less bitter according to the height of the passing wave. The schoolmaster is still the powerful antagonist of the priest and the chief factor in the politics of the village. He is often more advanced than the government and has even begun to rebel on some occasions. Socialism is gaining the ground which religion loses, and its internal divisions do not seem to take from its strength.

All these symptoms would be disheartening were it not for the renewed activity of some groups of young men, and the attitude of the clergy, which the circumstances are stirring to more activity. No speedy change is to be expected in the minds of the people; possibly we are not yet at the lowest ebb. But there is no necessity of despairing. We should remember that the night is darkest before dawn.

Shall the situation created by the new law make for good or for evil? Very likely for good in the long run. Of course, there has been a considerable falling off of late years, and the ruins heaped up since 1900 are appalling. It seems that in a short period France has turned from a Catholic to an infidel country. But it was not ground really lost during that time; it was the revealing of a loss that, for a long period, had proceeded slowly and become greater and greater every day. We begin to realize now that we are in the same situation as the Catholic minority in a Protestant country, and ought to secure the same position. To make ourselves respected and spread the faith, little by little, in a country that is not to be preserved, but converted anew, should be our ambition.

Now, the situation is such as to call forth the dormant energies of the clergy, and a part of the population is bound to respond in

time. The pressure of circumstances is acting as a kind of incentive; it will be felt still more when reinforced by the pressure of need. On the other side, the religious question is always to the front. When it appears on the scene all the others slip away behind the scenes; so much so that when the government wants to postpone an obnoxious social measure that has been long clamored for it has only to raise the religious question. In a moment everybody is up, for or against, and the rest is forgotten. It is not easy to reconcile this with the religious indifference that is so prevalent in France; but it is so. The religious problems are seldom the object of dispassionate discussion; they are occasions of hatred and love much more than of disquisition, because they are felt to be bound with the most intimate fibres of the heart.

What a zealous and alert clergy may do in such circumstances, I hope the future will show. At least it seems difficult to go to sleep now, and this difficulty is the most hopeful sign of the times. Up to the present there has been nothing definite; many thoughts have been stirred and many attempts tried. The old conservative organization that was contrived for the preservation of the faithful is felt to be no longer sufficient. A conquering army should not always remain camping in the trenches. But when it comes to what is to be done, we find but chaos, experiments of all sorts, confusion, bewilderment. All is still left suspended, undetermined; the legal situation, the means of living and the means of conquering. But a general commotion is felt throughout the great body of the Church, and it is better than immobility, which is death. When the confused elements are sifted, I hope the French Church will emerge as a smaller, but more compact body, full of true religious life. But we must not expect this to be done in a day; it will be a long and laborious struggle, not a sudden and easy triumph.

ABBE HERMELINE.

Paris, France.

DE MODERNISTARUM DOCTRINIS.

AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES ARCHIEPISCOPOS EPISCOPOS ALIOSQUE
 LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA
 SEDE HABENTES.

PIUS PAPA X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

PASCENDI dominici gregis mandatum Nobis divinitus officium id munus in primis a Christo assignatum habet, ut traditae sanctis fidei depositum vigilantissime custodiat, repudiatis profanis vocum novitatibus atque oppositionibus falsi nominis scientiae. Quae quidem supremi providentia pastoris nullo plane non tempore catholico agmini necessaria fuit: etenim, auctore humani generis hoste, nunquam defuere "viri loquentes perversa¹, vaniloqui et seductores², errantes et in errorem mittentes³." Verumtamen inimicorum crucis Christi, postrema hac aetate, numerum crevisse admodum fatendum est; qui, artibus omnino novis astutaeque plenae, vitalem Ecclesiae vim elidere, ipsumque, si queant, Christi regnum evertere funditus nituntur. Quare silere Nobis diutius haud licet, ne muneri sanctissimo deesse videamur, et benignitas, qua, spe senioris consilii, huc usque usi sumus, officii oblitio reputetur.

Qua in re ut moram ne interponamus illud in primis exigit, quod fautores errorum iam non inter apertos hostes quaerendi sunt modo; verum, quod dolendum maxime verendumque est, in ipso latent sinu gremioque Ecclesiae, eo sane nocentiores, quo minus perspicui.—Loquimur, Venerabiles Fratres, de multis e catholicorum laicorum numero, quin, quod longe miserabilius, ex ipso sacerdotum coetu, qui, fucoso quodam Ecclesiae amore, nullo solido philosophiae ac theologiae praesidio, immo adeo venenatis imbuti penitus doctrinis quae ab Ecclesiae osoribus traduntur, Ecclesiae eiusdem renovatores, omni posthabita modestia animi, se iactant; factoque audacius agmimine, quidquid sanctius est in Christi opere impetunt, ipsa haud incolumi divini Reparatoris persona, quam, ausu sacrilego, ad purum putumque hominem extenuant.

Homines huiusmodi Ecclesiae Nos hostibus adscribere, etsi mirantur ipsi, nemo tamen mirabitur iure, qui, mente animi seposita cuius penes Deum arbitrium est, illorum doctrinas et loquendi agendique rationes cognovit. Enimvero non is a veritate discedat, qui eos Ecclesiae adversarios quovis alio perniciosiores habeat.—Nam non hi extra Ecclesiam, sed intra, ut diximus, de illius perniciem consilia agitant sua: quomobrem in ipsis fere Ecclesiae venis atque in visceribus periculum residet, eo securiore damno, quo illi intimius Ecclesiam norunt. Adde quod securim non ad ramos surculosque ponunt; sed ad radicem ipsam, fidem nimirum fideique fibras altissimas. Icta autem radice hac immortalitatis, virus per omnem arborem sic propagare pergunt, ut catholicae veritatis nulla sit pars unde manus absterneant, nulla quam corrumpere non elaborent. Porro, mille nocendi artes dum adhibent, nihil illis callidius nihil insidiosius: nam et rationalistam et catholicum promiscue agunt, idque adeo simulatissime, ut incautum quemque facile in errorem pertrahant; cumque temeritate maxime valeant, nullum est consecutionum genus quod horreant aut non obfirmate secureque obtendant. Accedit praeterea in illis, aptissime ad fallendos animos, genus vitae cummaxime actuosum, assidua ac vehemens ad omnem eruditionem occupatio, moribus plerumque austeris quaesita laus. Demum, quod fere medicinae fiduciam tollit, disciplinis ipsi suis sic animo sunt comparati, ut dominationem omnem spernant nullaque recipient frena; et freti mendaci quadam conscientia animi, nituntur veritatis studio tribuere quod uni reapse superbiae ac pervicaciaetribuendum est.—Equidem speravimus huiusmodi quandoque homines ad meliora revocare: quo in genere suavitatem primum tamquam cum filiis, tum vero severitatem, demum, quamquam inviti, animadversione publica usi sumus. Nostis tamen, Venerabiles Fratres, quam haec fecerimus inaniter: cervicem, ad horam deflexam,

¹ Act. xx., 30.

² Tit. i., 10.

³ II. Tim. iii., 13.

mox extulerunt superbius. Iam si illorum solummodo res ageretur, dissimulare forsitan possemus: sed catholici nominis et contra securitas agitur. Quapropter silentium, quod habere diutius piaculum foret, interciperi necesse est; ut personatos male homines, quales reapse sunt, universae Ecclesiae demonstremus.

Quia vero modernistarum (sic enim iure in vulgus audiunt) callidissimum artificium est, ut doctrinas suas non ordine digestas proponant atque in unum collectas, sed sparsas veluti atque invicem seiunctas, ut nimirum ancipites et quasi vagi videantur, cum e contra firmi sint et constantes; praestat, Venerabiles Fratres, doctrinas easdem uno heic conspectu exhibere primum, nexumque indicare quo invicem coalescunt, ut deinde errorum causas scrutemur, ac remedia ad averruncandam perniciem praescribamus.

Ut autem in abstrusiore re ordinatim procedamus, illud ante omnia notandum est, modernistarum quemlibet plures agere personas ac veluti in se commiscere; philosophum nimirum, credentem, theologum, historicum, criticum, apologetam, instauratorem: quas singulatim omnes distinguere oportet, qui eorum systema rite cognoscere et doctrinarum antecessiones consequutionesque pervidere velit.

Iam, ut a philosopho exordiamur, philosophiae religiosae fundamentum in doctrina illa modernistae ponunt, quam vulgo "agnosticismum" vocant. Vi huius humana ratio "phaenomenis" omnino includitur, rebus videlicet quae apparent eaque specie qua apparent: earumdem praetergredi terminos nec ius nec potestatem habet. Quare nec ad Deum se erigere potis est, nec illius existentiam, ut per ea quae videntur, agnoscere. Hinc infertur, Deum scientiae obiectum directe nullatenus esse posse; ad historiam vero quod attinet, Deum subiectum historicum minime censendum esse.—His autem positis, quid de "naturali theologia," quid de "motivis credibilitatis," quid de "externa revelatione" fiat, facile quisque perspicet. Ea nempe modernistae penitus et medio tollunt, et ad "intellectualismum" amandant; ridendum, inquit, systema ac iamdiu emortuum. Neque illos plane retinet quod eiusmodi errorum portenta apertissime damnavit Ecclesia: siquidem Vaticana Synodus sic sanciebat: "Si quis dixerit Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea quae facta sunt, naturali rationis humanae lumine certo cognosci non posse, anathema sit;*" Itemque: "Si quis dixerit fieri non posse, aut non expedire, ut per revelationem divinam homo de Deo cultuque ei exhibendo edoceatur, anathema sit;*" ac demum: "Si quis dixerit revelationem divinam externis signis credibilem fieri non posse, ideoque sola interna cuiusque experientia aut inspiratione privata homines ad fidem moveri debere, anathema sit."—Qua vero ratione ex "agnosticismo," qui solum est in ignorance, ad "atheismum" scientificum atque historicum modernistae transeant, qui contra totum est in inficitione positus: quo idcirco ratiocinationis iure, ex eo quod ignoretur utrum humanarum gentium historiae intervenerit Deus necne, fiat gressus ad eandem historiam neglecto omnino Deo explicandam, ac si reapse non intervenerit: novit plane qui possit. Id tamen ipsis fixumque est, atheam debere esse scientiam itemque historiam; in quarum finibus non nisi "phaenomenis" possit esse locus, exturbato penitus Deo et quidquid divinum est.—Qua ex doctrina absurdissima quid de sanctissima Christi persona, quid de Ipsius vitae mortisque mysteriis, quid pariter de anastasi deque in caelum ascensu tenendum sit, mox plane videbimus.

Hic tamen "agnosticismus," in disciplina modernistarum, non nisi ut pars negans habenda est: positiva, ut aiunt, in "immanentia vitali" constituitur. Harum nempe ad aliam ex altera sic procedunt.—Religio, sive ea naturalis est sive supra naturam, ceu quodlibet factum, explicationem aliquam admittat oportet. Explicatio autem, naturali theologia deleta adituque ad revelationem ob relecta credibilitatis argumenta intercluso, immo etiam revelatione qualibet externa penitus sublata, extra hominem inquiritur frustra. Est igitur in ipso homine quaerenda: et quoniam religio vitae quaedam est forma, in vita omnino hominis rependienda est. Ex hoc "immanentiae religiosae" principium asseritur. Vitalis porro cuiuscumque phaenomeni, cuiusmodi religionem esse iam dictum est, prima veluti motio indigentia quapiam seu impulsione est repetenda: primordia vero, si de vita pressius loquamur, ponenda sunt in motu quodam cordis, qui "sensus" dicitur. Eam ob rem, cum religionis obiectum sit Deus, concludendum omnino est, fidem, quae initium est ac fundamentum cuiusvis religionis, in sensu quodam intimo collocari debere, qui ex indigentia divini oriatur. Haec porro divini indigentia, quia nonnisi certis aptisque in complexibus sentitur, pertinere ad conscientiae ambitum ex se non potest; latet autem primo infra conscientiam, seu, ut mutato vocabulo a moderna philosophia loquuntur, in "subconscientia," ubi etiam illius radix occulta manet atque

⁴ "De Revel," can. i.

⁵ Ibid, can. ii.

⁶ "De Fide," can. iii.

indeprehensa.—Petet quis forsitan, haec divini indigentia, quam homo in se ipse percipiat, quo demum pacto in religionem evadat. Ad haec modernistae: Scientia atque historia, inquit, duplici includuntur termino; altero externo, aspectabili nimirum mundo, altero interno, qui est conscientia. Alterutrum ubi attigerint, ultra quo procedant non habent; hos enim praeter fines adest “incognoscibile.” Coram hoc “incognoscibili,” sive illud sit extra hominem ultraque aspectabilem naturam rerum, sive intus in “subscientia” lateat, indigentia divini in animo ad religionem prono, nullo, secundum “fideismi” scita, praevergente mentis iudicio, peculiarem quendam commovet “sensum:” hic vero divinam ipsam “realitatem,” tum tamquam obiectum tum tamquam sui causam intimam, in se implicatam habet atque hominem quodammodo cum Deo coniungit. Est porro hic “sensus” quem modernistae fidei nomine appellant, estque illis religionis initium.

Sed non hic philosophandi, seu rectius delirandi, finis. In eiusmodi enim “sensu” modernistae non fidem tantum reperiunt; sed, cum fide inque ipsa fide, prout illam intelligunt, “revelationi” locum esse affirmant. Enimvero eequid amplius ad revelationem quis postulet? An non revelationem dicemus, aut saltem revelationis exordium, “sensum” illum religiosum in conscientia apparentem; quin et Deum ipsum, etsi confusus, sese, in eodem religioso “sensu,” animis manifestantem? Subdunt vero: cum fidei Deus obiectum sit aequae et causae, revelatio illa et de Deo pariter eda de Deo est; habet Deum videlicet revelantem simul ac revelatum. Hinc autem, Venerabiles Fratres, affirmatio illa modernistarum perabsurda, qua religio quaelibet, pro diverso adpectu, naturalis una ac supernaturalis dicenda est. Hinc conscientiae ac revelationis promiscua significatio. Hinc lex, qua “conscientia religiosa” ut regula universalis traditur, cum revelatione penitus aequanda, cui subesse omnes oporteat, supremam etiam in Ecclesia potestatem, sive haec doceat sive de sacris disciplinave statuatur.

Attamen in toto hoc processu, unde, ex modernistarum sententia, fides ac revelatio prodeunt, unum est magnopere attendendum, non exigui quidem momenti obsequutiones historico-criticas, quas inde illi eruunt.—Nam “Incognoscibile,” de quo loquuntur, non se fidei sistit ut nudum quid aut singulare; sed contra in phaenomeno aliquo arcte inhaerens, quod, quamvis ad campum scientiae aut historiae pertinet, ratione tamen aliqua praetegreditur; sive hoc phaenomenon sit factum aliquid naturae, arcani quidpiam in se continens, sive sit quivis unus ex hominibus, cuius ingenium acta verba cum ordinariis historiae legibus componi haud posse videntur. Tum vero fides, ab “Incognoscibili” allecta quod cum phaenomeno iungitur, totum ipsum phaenomenon complectitur ac sua vita quodammodo permeat. Ex hoc autem duo consequuntur. Primum, quaedam phaenomeni “transfiguratio,” per elationem scilicet supra veras illius condiciones, qua aptior fiat materia ad induendam divini formam, quam fides est inductura. Secundum, phaenomenon eiusdem aliquapiam, sic vocare liceat, “defiguratio” inde nata, quod fides illi, loci temporisque adiunctis exempto, tribuit quae reapse non habet: quod usuvenerit praecipue, quum de phaenomenis agitur exacti temporis, eoque amplius quo sunt vetustiora. Ex gemino hoc capite binos iterum modernistae erunt canones; qui, alteri additi iam ex agnosticismo habito, critices historicae fundamenta constituunt. Exemplo res illustrabitur; sitque illud e Christi persona petitur. In persona Christi, ajunt, scientia atque historia nil praeter hominem offendunt. Ergo, vi primi canonis ex agnosticismo deducti, ex eius historia quidquid divinum redolet delendum est. Porro, vi alterius canonis, Christi persona historica “transfigurata” est a fide: ergo subducendum ab ea quidquid ipsam evehit supra conditiones historicas. Demum, vi tertii canonis, eadem persona Christi a fide “defigurata” est: ergo removenda sunt ab illa sermones, acta; quidquid, uno verbo, ingenio, statui, educationi eius, loco ac temporibus vixit, minime respondet.—Mira equidem ratiocinandi ratio: sed haec modernistarum critice.

“Religiosus” igitur “sensus,” qui per “vitalem immanentiam” e latebris “subscientiae” erumpit, germen est totius religionis ac ratio pariter omnium, quae in religione quavis fuere aut sunt futura. Rudis quidem initio ac fere informis, eiusmodi “sensus,” paulatim atque influxu arcani illius principii unde ortum habuit, adolevit una cum progressu humanae vitae, cuius, ut diximus, quaedam est forma. Habemus igitur religionis cuius libet, etsi supernaturalis, originem: sunt nempe illae “religiosi sensus” merae explicationes. Nec quis catholicam exceptam putet; immo vero ceteris omnino parem; nam ea in conscientia Christi, electissimae naturae viri, cuiusmodi nemo unus fuit nec erit, “vitalis” processu “immanentiae,” non aliter, nata est.—Stupent profecto, qui haec audiant, tantam ad asserendum audaciam tantum sacrilegium! Attamen, Venerabiles Fratres, non haec sunt solum ab incredulis effutita temere. Catholici homines, immo vero e sacerdotibus plures, haec palam edisserunt; talibusque deliramentis Ecclesiam se instauraturos lactant! Non heic iam

de veteri errore agitur, quo naturali humanae supernaturalis ordinis veluti ius tribuebatur. Longius admodum processum est: ut nempe sanctissima religio nostra, in homine Christo aequae ac in nobis, a natura, ex se suaque sponte, edita affirmetur. Hoc autem nil profecto aptius ad omnem supernaturalem ordinem abolendum. Quare a Vaticana Synodo iure summo sancitum fuit: "Si quis dixerit, hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem quae naturalem superet, divinitus evehi non posse, sed ex seipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem iugi profectu pertingere posse et debere, anathema sit."

Huc usque tamen, Venerabiles Fratres, nullum dari vidimus intellectui locum. Habet autem et ipse, ex modernistarum doctrina, suas in actu fidei partes. Quo dein pacto, advertisse praestat.—In "sensu" illo, inquit, quem saepius nominavimus, quoniam "sensus" est non cognitio, Deus quidem se homini sistit; verum confuse adeo ac permixte, ut a subiecto credente vix aut minime distinguatur. Necesse igitur est aliquo eundem sensum collustrari lumine, ut Deus inde omnino exiliat ac secernatur. Id nempe ad intellectum peraliret cuius est cogitare et analysim instituere; per quem homo vitalia phaenomena in se exsurgentia in species primum traducit, tum autem verbis significat. Hinc vulgata modernistarum enuntiatio: debere religiosum hominem fidem suam "cogitare."—Mens ergo, illi "sensui" adveniens, in eundem se inflectit, inque eo elaborat pictoris instar, qui obsoletam tabulae cuiusdam diagraphen collaret ut nitidius efferat: sic enim fere quidam modernistarum doctor rem explicat. In eiusmodi autem negotio mens dupliciter operatur: primum, naturali actu et spontaneo, redditque rem sententia quadam simplici ac vulgari; secundo vero reflexe ac penitius, vel, ut aiunt, "cogitationem elaborando," eloquiturque cogitata "secundariis" sententiis, derivatis quidem a prima illa simplici, limatioribus tamen ac distinctioribus. Quae "secundariae" sententiae, si demum a supremo Ecclesiae magisterio sanctae fuerint, constituent "dogma."

Sic igitur in modernistarum doctrina ventum est ad caput quoddam praecipuum, videlicet ad originem dogmatis atque ad ipsam dogmatis naturam. Originem enim dogmatis ponunt quidem in primigeniis illis formulis simplicibus, quae, quodam sub respectu, necessariae sunt fidei; nam revelatio, ut reapse sit, manifestam Dei notitiam in conscientia requirit. Ipsum tamen dogma "secundariis" proprie contineri formulis affirmare videntur.—Eius porro ut assequamur naturam, ante omnia inquirendum est, quaenam intercedat relatio inter "formulas religiosas" et "religiosum" animi "sensusm." Id autem facile intelliget, qui teneat "formularum" eiusmodi non alium esse finem, quam modum suppeditare credenti, quo sibi suae fidei rationem reddat. Quamobrem mediae illae sunt inter credentem eiusque fidem: ad fidem autem quod attinet, sunt inadaequatae eius obiecti notae, vulgo "symbola" vocitant; ad credentem quod spectat, sunt mera "instrumenta."—Quocirca nulla confici ratione potest, eas veritatem absolute continere: nam, quae "symbola," imagines sunt veritatis, atque ideo sensui religioso accommodandae, prout hic ad hominem refertur; quae "instrumenta," sunt veritatis vehicula, atque ideo accommodanda vicissim homini, prout refertur ad religiosum sensum. Obiectum autem "sensus religiosi," utpote quod "absoluto" continetur, infinitos habet adspectus, quorum modo hic modo alius apparere potest. Similiter homo, qui credit, aliis atque aliis uti potest conditionibus. Ergo et formulas, quas dogma appellamus, vicissitudini eidem subesse oportet, ac propterea varietati esse obnoxias. Ita vero ad intimam "evolutionem" dogmatis expeditum est iter.—Sophismatum profecto coacervatio infinita, quae religionem omnem pessumdat ac delet!

Evolvi tamen ac mutari dogma non posse solum sed oportere, et modernistae ipsi perfracte affirmant, et ex eorum sententiis aperte consequitur.—Nam inter praecipua doctrinae capita hoc illi habent, quod ab "immanentiae vitalis" principio deducunt: "formulas religiosas," ut "religiosae" reapse sint nec solum intellectus commentationes, vitales esse debere vitamque ipsam vivere "sensus religiosi." Quod non ita intelligendum est, quasi hae formulae, praesertim si mere imaginativae, sint pro ipso religioso sensu inventae; nihil enim refert admodum earum originis, ut etiam numeri vel qualitatibus: sed ita, ut eas "religiosus sensus," mutatione aliqua, si opus est, adhibita, "vitaliter" sibi adiungat. Scilicet, ut aliis dicamus, necesse est ut "formula primitiva" acceptetur a corde ab eoque sanciantur; itemque sub cordis ductu sit labor, quo "secundariae formulae" progignuntur. Hinc accidit quod debeant hae formulae, ut vitales sint, ad fidem pariter et ad credentem accommodatae esse ac manere. Quamobrem, si quavis ex causa huiusmodi accommodatio cesset, amittunt illae primigenias notiones ac mutari indigent.—Haec porro formularum dogmaticarum cum sit vis ac fortuna instabilis, mirum non est illas modernistis tanto esse ludibrio ac despectui; qui nihil e contra loquuntur atque extollunt nisi

religiosum sensum vitamque religiosas. Ideo et Ecclesiam audacissime carpunt tamquam devio itinere incedentem, quod ab externa formularum significatione religiosas vim ac moralem minime distinguat, et formulis notione carentibus casso labore ac tenacissime inhaerens, religionem ipsam dilabi permittat.—“Caeci” equidem “et duces caecorum,” qui superbo scientiae nomine inflati usque eo insaniunt ut aeternam veritatis notionem et germanum religionis sensum pervertant: novo invectorum systemate, “quo, ex proiecta et effrenata novitatum cupiditate, veritas, ubi certo consistit, non quaeritur, sanctisque et apostolicis traditionibus posthabitis, doctrinae aliae inanes, fuitiles, incertae nec ab Ecclesia probatae adsciscunt, quibus veritatem ipsam fulciri ac sustineri vanissimi homines arbitrantur.”⁸

Atque haec, Venerabiles Fratres, de modernista ut philosopho.—Iam si, ad credentem progressus, nosse quis velit unde hic in modernistis a philosopho distinguatur, illud advertere necesse est, etsi philosophus “realitatem” divini fidei obiectum admittat, hanc tamen ab illo “realitatem” non alibi reperiri nisi in credentis animo, ut obiectum sensus est et affirmationis atque ideo phaenomenorum ambitum non excedit: utrum porro in se illa extra sensum existat atque affirmationem huiusmodi, praeterit philosophus ac negligit. E contra modernistae credenti ratum ac certum est, “realitatem” divini reapse in se ipsam existere nec prosus a credente pendere. Quod si postules, in quo tandem haec credentis assertio nitatur; reponent: in privata cuiusque hominis “experientia.”—In qua affirmatione, dum equidem hi a rationalistis dissident, in protestantium tamen ac pseudomysticorum opinionem discedunt. Rem enim sic edisserunt: in “sensu religioso” quendam esse agnoscendum cordis intuitum; quo homo ipsam, sine medio, Dei “realitatem” attingit, tantamque de existentia Dei haurit persuasionem deque Dei tum intra tum extra hominem actione, ut persuasionem omnem, quae ex scientia peti possit, longe antecellat. Veram igitur ponunt experientiam, eamque rationali qualibet experientia praestantior: quam si quis, ut rationalistae, inficiatur, inde fieri affirmant, quod nolit is in eis se ipse constituere moralibus adiunctis, quae ad experientiam gignendam requirantur. Haec porro “experientia,” cum quis illam fuerit assequutus, proprie vereque credentem efficit.—Quam hic longe absumus a catholicis institutis! Commenta eiusmodi a Vaticana Synodo improbata iam vidimus.—His semel admissis una cum erroribus ceteris iam memoratis, quo pacto ad atheismum pateat via, inferius dicemus. Nunc statim advertisse iuverit, ex hac “experientiae” doctrina, coniuncta alteri de “symbolismo,” religionem quamlibet, ethnicorum minime excepta, ut veram esse habendam. Quidni etenim in religione quavis experientiae huiusmodi occurrant? occurrisse vero non unus asserit. Quo iure, autem modernistae veritatem experientiae abnuent, quam turca affirmet; verasque experientias unis catholicis indicabunt? Neque id reapse modernistae denegant; quin immo, subobscuri alii, alii apertissime, religiones omnes contendunt esse veras. Secus autem sentire nec posse, manifestum est. Nam religioni cuiquam quo tandem ex capite, secundum illorum praecepta, foret falsitas tribuenda? Certe vel ex fallacia “sensus religiosi,” vel quod falsiloqua sit formula ab intellectu prolata. Atqui “sensus religiosus” unus semper idemque est, etsi forte quandoque imperfectior: formula autem intellectus, ut vera sit, sufficit ut “religioso sensui” hominique credenti respondeat, quidquid de huius perspicuitate ingenii esse queat. Unum, ad summum, in religionum diversarum conflictu, modernistae contendere forte possint, catholicam, utpote vividiorum, plus habere veritatis; itemque christiano nomine digniorem eam esse, ut quae christianismi exordiis respondeat plenius.—Has consecutiones omnes ex datis antecedentibus fluere, nemini erit absonum. Illud stupendum cummaxime, catholicos dari viros ac sacerdotes, qui, etsi, ut autumari malumus, eiusmodi portenta horrent, agunt tamen ac si plene probent. Eas etenim errorum talium magistris tribuunt laudes, eos publice habent honores, ut sibi quisque suadeat facile, illos non homines honorare, aliquo forsitan numero non expertes, sed errores potius, suos hi aperte asserunt inque vulgus spargere omni ope nituntur.

Est aliud praeterea in hoc doctrinae capite, quod catholicae veritati est omnino infestum.—Nam istud de “experientia” praeceptum ad “traditionem” etiam transfertur, quam Ecclesia huc usque asseruit, eamque prorsus adimit. Enimvero modernistae sic traditionem intelligunt, ut sit “originalis experientiae” quaedam cum aliis communicatio per praedicationem, ope formulae intellectivae. Cui formulae propterea, praeter vim, ut aiunt, “repraesentativam, suggestivam” quandam adscribunt virtutem, tum in eo qui credit, ad “sensus religiosum” forte torpentem excitandum, instaurandamque “experientiam” aliquando habitam, tum in eis qui nondum credunt, ad “sensus religiosum” primo gignendum et “experientiam” producendam. Sic autem experientia religiosa late in populos propagatur; nec tantummodo in eos qui nunc sunt per praedicationem, sed in posteros etiam, tam per libros quam per verborum de aliis in alios replicationem.—Haec vero

⁸ Gregor. XVI. Ep. Encycl., “Singularem Nos,” 7 kal. iul. 1834.

experientiae communicatio radices quandoque agit vigetque; senescit quandoque statim ac moritur. Vigere autem, modernistis argumentum veritatis est: veritatem enim ac vitam promiscue habent. Ex quo inferre denuo licebit: religiones omnes quotquot extant veras esse, nam secus nec viverent.

Re porro huc adducta, Venerabiles Fratres, satis superque habemus ad recte cognoscendum, quem ordinem modernistae statuunt inter fidem et scientiam; quo etiam scientiae nomine historia apud illos notatur.—Ac primo quidem tenendum est, materiam uni obiectam materiae obiectae alteri externam omnino esse ab eaque seiunctam. Fides enim id unice spectat, quod scientia “incognoscibile” sibi esse profitetur. Hinc diversum utrique pensum: scientia versatur in phaenomenis, ubi nullus fidel locus; fides e contra versatur in divinis, quae scientia penitus ignorat. Unde demum conficitur, inter fidem et scientiam nunquam esse posse discidium: si enim suum quaeque locum teneat, occurrere sibi invicem nunquam poterunt, atque ideo nec contradicere.—Quibus si qui forte obiciant, quaedam in aspectabili occurrere natura rerum quae ad fidem etiam pertinent, uti humanam Christi vitam; negabunt. Nam, etsi haec phaenomenis accensur, tamen, quatenus vita fidei imbuuntur, et a fide, quo supra dictum est modo, “transfigurata” ac “defigurata” fuerunt, a sensibili nunquam sunt abrepta et in divini materiam translata. Quamobrem poscenti ulterius, an Christus vera patrarit miracula vereque futura praesenserit, an vere revixerit atque in caelum conscenderit; scientia agnostica abnuet, fides affirmabit; ex hoc tamen nulla erit inter utramque pugna. Nam abnuet alter ut philosophus philosophos alloquens, Christum scilicet unice contemplatus secundum “realitatem historicam;” affirmabit alter ut credens cum credentibus loquutus, Christi vitam spectans prout “iterum vivitur” a fide et in fide.

Ex his tamen fallitur vehementer qui reputet posse opinari, fidem et scientiam alteram sub altera nulla penitus ratione esse subiectam. Nam de scientia quidem recte vereque existimabit; secus autem de fide, quae, non uno tantum sed triplici ex capite, scientiae subici dicenda est. Primum namque advertere oportet, in facto quovis religioso, detracta “divina realitate” quamque de illa habet “experientiam” qui credit, cetera omnia, praesseritim vero “religiosas formulas,” phaenomenorum ambitum minime transgredi, atque ideo cadere sub scientiam. Liceat utique credenti, si volet, de mundo excedere; quamdiu tamen in mundo deget, leges, obtutum, iudicia scientiae atque historiae numquam, velit nolit, effugiet. Praeterea, quamvis dictum est Deum solius fidel esse obiectum, id de divina quidem “realitate” concedendum est, non tamen de “idea” Dei. Haec quippe scientiae subest; quae, dum in ordine, ut aiunt, logico philosophatur, quidquid etiam absolutum est attingit atque ideale. Quocirca philosophia seu scientia cognoscendi de idea Dei ius habet, eamque in sui evolutione moderandi et, si quid extrarium invaserit, corrigendi. Hinc modernistarum effatum: evolutionem religiosam cum morali et intellectuall componi debere; videlicet, ut quidam tradit quem magistrum sequuntur, eisdem subdi.—Accedit demum quod homo dualitatem in se ipse non patitur, quamobrem credentem quaedam intima urget necessitas fidem cum scientia sic componendi, ut a generali ne decrepet idea, quam scientia exhibet de hoc mundo universo. Sic ergo conficitur, scientiam a fide omnino solutam esse, fidem contra, ut ut scientiae extranea praedicetur, eidem subesse.—Quae omnia, Venerabiles Fratres, contraria prorsus sunt iis quae Pius IX. decessor Noster tradebat docens:⁹ “Philosophiae esse, in iis quae ad religionem pertinent, non dominari sed ancillari, non praescribere quid credendum sit, sed rationabili obsequio amplecti, neque altitudinem scrutari mysteriorum Dei, sed illam pie humiliterque revereri.” Modernistae negotium plane invertunt: quibus idcirco applicari queunt, quae Gregorius IX. item decessor Noster de quibusdam suae aetatis theologis scribebat:¹⁰ “Quidam apud vos, spiritu vanitatis ut uter distenti, positos a Patribus terminos profana transferre satagunt novitate; coelestis paginae intellectum . . . ad doctrinam philosophicam rationalium inclinando, ad ostentationem scientiae, non profectum aliquem auditorum . . . Ipsi, doctrinis variis et peregrinis abducti, redigunt caput in caudam, et ancillae cogunt famulari reginam.”

Quod profecto apertius patebit intuenti quo pacto modernistae agant, accommodate omnino ad ea quae docent. Multa enim ab eis contrarie videntur scripta vel dicta, ut quis facile illos aestimet ancipites atque incertos. Verumtamen consulte id et considerate accidit; ex opinione scilicet quam habent de fidei atque scientiae seiunctione mutua. Hinc in eorum libris quaedam offendimus quae catholicis omnino probet; quaedam, aversa pagina, quae rationalistam dictasae autumes. Hinc, historiam scribentes, nullam de divinitate Christi mentionem iniiciunt; ad conclusionem

⁹ Brev. ad Ep. Wratislav. 15 iun. 1857.

¹⁰ Ep. ad Magistros theol. paris, non. iul. 1223.

vero in templis eam firmissime profitentur. Item, enarrantes historiam, Concilia et Patres nullo loco habent; catechesim autem si tradunt, illa atque illos cum honore afferunt. Hinc etiam exegesim theologicam et pastorem a scientifica et historica secernunt. Similiter, ex principio quod scientia a fide nullo pacto pendeat, quum de philosophia, de historia, de critica disserunt, Lutheri sequi vestigia non exhorrentes,¹¹ despicientiam praeceptorum catholicorum, sanctorum Patrum, oecumenicarum synodorum, magisterii ecclesiastici omnimodis ostentant; de qua si carpantur, libertatem sibi adimi conqueruntur. Professi demum fidem esse scientiae subiiciendam, Ecclesiam passim aperteque reprehendunt quod sua dogmata philosophiae opinionibus subdere et accommodare obstinatissime renuat: ipsi vero, veteri ad hunc finem theologia sublata, novam invehere contendunt, quae philosophorum delirationibus obsecundet.

Hic iam, Venerabiles Fratres, nobis fit aditus ad modernistas in theologico agone spectandos. Salebrosum quidem opus: sed paucis absolvendum. —Agitur nimirum de concilianda fide cum scientia, idque non aliter quam una alteri subiecta. Eo in genere modernista theologus eisdem utitur principiis, quae usui philosopho esse vidimus, illeque ad credentem aptat: principia iniquimus "immanentiae" et "symbolismi." Sic autem rem expeditissime perficit. Traditur a philosopho "principium fidei esse immanens;" a credente additur "hoc principium Deum esse;" concludit ipse "Deus" ergo "est immanens in homine." Hinc "immanentia theologica." Iterum: philosopho certum est "repraesentationes obiecti fidei esse tantum symbolicas;" credenti pariter certum est "fidel obiectum esse Deum in se;" theologus igitur colligit: "repraesentationes divinae realitatis esse symbolicas." Hinc "symbolismus theologicus." —Errores profecto maximi: quorum uterque quam sit perniciosus, consequentis inspectis patebit. —Nam, ut de "symbolismo" statim dicamus, cum symbola talia sint respectu obiecti, respectu autem credentis sint instrumenta; cavendum primum, inquit, credenti, ne ipsi formulae ut formula est plus nimio inhaereat, sed illa utendum unice ut absolutae adhaerescat veritati, quam formula reteggit simul ac tegit nititurque exprimere quin unquam assequatur. Addunt praeterea, formulas eiusmodi esse a credente adhibendas quatenus ipsum iuverint; ad commodum enim datae sunt non ad impedimentum: incolumi utique honore qui, ex sociali respectu, debetur formulis, quas publicum magisterium aptas ad communem conscientiam exprimendam iudicavit, quamdiu scilicet idem magisterium secus quidpiam non edixerit. —De "immanentia" autem quid reapse modernistae sentiant, difficile est indicare; non enim eadem omnium opinio. Sunt qui in eo collocant, quod Deus agens intime adsit in homine, magis quam ipse sibi homo; quod plane, si recte intelligitur, reprehensionem non habet. Alii in eo ponunt, quod actio Dei una sit cum actione naturae ut causae primae cum causae secundae; quod ordinem supernaturalem reapse delet. Alii demum sic explicant, ut suspicionem efficiant pantheisticae significationis; id autem cum ceteris eorum doctrinis cohaeret aptius.

Huc vero "immanentiae" pronuntiato aliud adicitur, quod a "permanencia divina" vocare possumus: quae duo inter se eo fere modo differunt, quo "experientia" privata ab "experientia" per traditionem transmissa. Exemplum rem collustrabit: sitque ab Ecclesia, et Sacramentis deductum. Ecclesia, inquit, et Sacramenta a Christo ipso instituta minime credenda sunt. Cavet id agnosticismus, qui in Christo nil praeter hominem novit, cuius conscientia religiosa, ut ceterorum hominum, sensim efformata est: cavet lex immanentiae, quae externas, ut aiunt, "applicationes" respuit: cavet item lex evolutionis, quae ut germina evolvantur tempus postulat et quandam adiunctorum sibi succedentium seriem: cavet demum historia, quae talem reapse rei cursum fuisse ostendit. Attamen Ecclesiam et Sacramenta "mediate" a Christo fuisse instituta retinendum est. Qui vero? Conscientias christianas omnes in Christi conscientia virtute quodammodo inclusas affirmant, ut in semine planta. Quoniam autem germina vitam seminis vivunt; christiani omnes vitam Christi vivere dicendi sunt. Sed Christi vita, secundum fidem divina est: ergo et christianorum vita. Si igitur haec vita, decursu aetatum, Ecclesiae et Sacramentis initium dedit: lue omnino dicitur initium huiusmodi esse a Christo ac divinum esse. Sic omnino conficiunt divinas esse etiam Scripturas sacras, divina dogmata. —His porro modernistarum theologia ferme absolvitur. Brevis profecto supellex: sed ei perabundans, qui profiteatur, scientiae, quidquid praeceperit, semper esse obtemperandum. —Horum ad cetera quae dicemus applicationem quisque facile per se viderit.

¹¹ Prop. 29 damn. a Leone X., Bull. "Exsurge Domine" 16 maii 1520. "Via nobis facta est enervandi auctoritatem Conciliorum, et libere contradicendi eorum gestis et iudicandi eorum decreta, et confidenter confitendi quidquid verum videtur, sive probatum fuerit. sive reprobatum a quocumque Concilio."

De origine fidei deque eius natura attigimus huc usque. Fidei autem cum multa sint germina, praecipua vero Ecclesia, dogma sacra et religiones, libri quos sanctos nominamus; de his quoque quid modernistae doceant, inquirendum.—Atque ut dogma initium ponamus, huius quae sit origo et natura iam supra indicatum est. Oritur illud ex impulsione quadam seu necessitate, vi cuius qui credit in suis cogitatis elaborat, ut conscientia tam sua quam aliorum illustretur magis. Est hic labor in rimando totus expoliendoque primigeniam mentis “formulam,” non quidem in se illam secundum logicam explicationem, sed secundum circumstantia, seu, ut minus apte ad intelligendum inquit, “vitaliter.” Inde fit ut, circa illam, “secundariae” quaedam, ut iam inuimus, sensim enascentur formulae; quae postea in unum corpus coagmentatae vel in unum doctrinae aedificium cum a magisterio publico sancitae fuerint utpote communi conscientiae respondentes, dicuntur dogma. Ab hoc discernendae sunt probe theologorum commentationes: quae ceteroqui, quamvis vitam dogmatis non vivunt, non omnino tamen sunt inutiles, tum ad religionem cum scientia componendam et oppositiones inter ilias tollendas, tum ad religionem ipsam extrinsecus illustrandam protuendamque; forte etiam utilitati fuerint novo cuidam futuro dogmati materiam praeparando.—De cultu sacrorum haud foret multis dicendum, nisi eo quoque nomine Sacramenta venirent; de quibus maximi modernistarum errores. Cultum ex duplici impulsione seu necessitate oriri perhibent; omnia etenim, ut vidimus, in eorum systemate impulsionebus intimis seu necessitatibus gigni asseruntur. Altera est ad sensibile quiddam religioni tribuendum, altera ad eam proferendam, quod fieri utique nequaquam possit sine forma quadam sensibili et consecrantibus actibus; quae Sacramenta dicimus. Sacramenta autem modernistis nuda sunt symbola seu signa; quamvis non vi carentia. Quam vim ut indicent, exemplo ipsi utuntur verborum quorundam; quae vulgo fortunam dicuntur sortita, eo quod virtutem conceperint ad notiones quasdam propagandas, robustas maximeque percellentes animos. Sicut ea verba ad notiones, sic Sacramenta ad sensum religiosum ordinata sunt: nihil praeterea. Clarius profecto dicerent, si Sacramenta unice ad nutriendam fidem instituta affirmarent. Hoc tamen Tridentina Synodus damnavit:¹² “Si quis dixerit haec sacramenta propter solam fidem nutriendam instituta fuisse, anathema sit.”

De librorum etiam sacrorum natura et origine aliquid iam delibavimus. Eos, ad modernistarum scita, definire probe quis possit syllogen “experientiarum,” non cuique passim advenientium, sed extraordinarium atque insignium, quae in quapiam religione sunt habitae.—Sic prorsus modernistae docent de libris nostris tum veteris tum novi testamenti. Ad suas tamen opiniones callidissime notant: quamvis experientia sit praesentis temporis, posse tamen illam de praeteritis aequae ac de futuris materiam sumere, prout videlicet qui credit vel exacta rursus per recordationem in modum “praesentium vivit,” vel futura per praeroceptionem. Id autem explicat quomodo historici quoque et apocalyptici in libris sacris censi queant.—Sic igitur in hisce libris Deus quidem loquitur per credentem; sed, uti fert theologia modernistarum, per “immanentiam” solummodo et “permanentiam vitalem.”—Quaeremus, quid tum de inspiratione? Haec respondent, ab impulsione illa, nisi forte vehementiâ, nequaquam secernitur, qua credens ad fidem suam verbo scriptove aperiendam adigitur. Simile quid habemus in poetica inspiratione; quare quidam alebat: Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo. Hoc modo Deus initium dici debet inspirationis sacrorum librorum.—De qua praeterea inspiratione modernistae addunt, nihil omnino esse in sacris libris quod illa careat. Quod quum affirmant, magis eos crederes orthodoxos quam recentiores alios, qui inspirationem aliquantum coangustant, ut, exempli causa, quum “tacitas” sic dictas “citationes” invehunt. Sed haec illi verbo tenus ac simulate. Nam si Biblia ex agnosticis praecceptis iudicamus, humanum scilicet opus, ab hominibus pro hominibus exaratum, licet ius theologo detur ea per “immanentiam” divina praedicandi; qui demum inspiratio coarctari possit? Generalem utique modernistae sacrorum librorum inspirationem asseverant: catholico tamen sensu nullam admittunt.

Largiorem dicendi segetem offerunt, quae modernistarum schola de Ecclesia imaginatur.—Ponunt initio eam ex duplici necessitate oriri, una in credente quovis, in eo praesertim qui primigeniam ac singularem aliquam sit nactus experientiam, ut fidem suam cum aliis communicet; altera, postquam fides communis inter plures evaserit, in “collectivitate,” ad coalescendum in societatem et ad commune bonum tuendum, augendum, propagandum. Quid igitur Ecclesia partus est “conscientiae collectivae” seu consociationis consociatarum singularium, quae vi “permanentiae vitalis,” a primo aliquo credente pendeant, videlicet, pro catholicis, a Christo.—Porro societas quaequam moderatrice auctoritate indiget, cuius sit officium consociatos omnes in communem finem dirigere, et compagis elementa tueri prudenter, quae,

¹² Sess. vii., “de Sacramentis in genere,” can. v.

in religioso coetu, docarina et cultu obsolvuntur. Hinc in Ecclesia catholica auctoritas tergemina; "disciplinaria, dogmatica, cultualis."—Iam auctoritatis huius natura ex origine colligenda est; ex natura vero iura atque officia repetenda. Praeteritis aetatibus vulgaris fuit error quod auctoritas in Ecclesiam extrinsecus accesserit, nimirum immediate a Deo; quare "autocratica" merito habebatur. Sed haec nunc temporis obsolescere. Quo modo Ecclesia et conscientiarum collectivitate emanasse dicitur, eo pariter auctoritas ab ipsa Ecclesia vitaliter emanat. Auctoritas igitur, sicut Ecclesia, ex conscientia religiosa oritur, atque ideo eidem subest; quam subiectionem si spreverit, in tyrannidem vertitur. Ea porro tempestate nunc vivimus, quum libertatis sensus in fastigium summum excrevit. In civili statu conscientia publica populare regimen inexit. Sed conscientia in homine, aequae atque vita, una est. Nisi ergo in hominum conscientiis intestinum velit excitare bellum ac fovere, auctoritati Ecclesiae officium inest democraticis utendi formis; eo vel magis quod, ni faxit, exitium imminet. Nam amens profecto fuerit, qui in sensu libertatis, qualis nunc viget, regressum posse fieri aliquando autumet. Constrictus vi atque inclusus, fortior se profundet, Ecclesia pariter ac religio deleta.—Haec omnia modernistae ratiocinantur; qui propterea toti sunt in indagandis viis ad auctoritatem Ecclesiae cum credentium libertate componendam.

Sed enim non intra domesticos tantum parietes habet Ecclesia, quibuscum amice cohaerere illam oporteat; habet et extra. Non una namque ipsa occupat mundum; occupant aequae consociationes aliae, quibuscum commercium et usus necessario intercedat. Quae iura igitur quae sint Ecclesiae officia cum civilibus consociationibus determinandum est itaque, nec aliter determinandum nisi ex ipsius Ecclesiae natura, qualem nimirum modernistae nobis describere.—In hoc autem eisdem plane regulis utuntur, quae supra pro scientia, atque fide sunt allatae. Ibi "obiectis" sermo erat, hic de "finibus." Sicut igitur "ratione obiecti" fidem ac scientiam extraneas ab invicem vidimus: sic Status et Ecclesia alter ab altera extranea sunt ob fines quos persequuntur, temporalem ille, haec spirituales. Licuit profecto alias temporale spirituali subilci; licuit de "mixtis" quaestionibus sermonem interseri, in quibus Ecclesia ut domina ac regina intererat, quia nempe Ecclesia a Deo, sine medio, ut ordinis supernaturalis est auctor, instituta ferebatur. Sed iam haec a philosophis atque historicis respuuntur. Status ergo ab Ecclesia dissociandus, sicut etiam catholicus a cive. Quamobrem catholicus quilibet, quia etiam civis, ius atque officium habet, Ecclesiae auctoritate neglecta, eius optatis, consiliis praeceptisque posthabitis, spretis immo reprehensionibus, ea persequendi quae civitatis utilitati conducere arbitretur. Viam ad agendum civi praescribere praetextu quolibet, abusus ecclesiasticae potestatis est, toto nisu reiiciendus.—Ea nimirum, Venerabiles Fratres, unde haec omnia dimanant, eadem profecto sunt, quae Pius VI. decessor Noster, in Constitutione apostolica "Auctorem fidei," solemniter damnavit.¹³

Sed modernistarum scholae satis non est debere Statum ab Ecclesia seiungi. Sicut fidem, quoad elementa, ut inquit, phaenomenica scientiae subdi oportet, sic in temporalibus negotiis Ecclesiam subesse Statui. Hoc quidem illi aperte nondum forte asserunt; ratiocinationis tamen vi coguntur admittere. Posito etenim quod in temporalibus rebus Status possit unus, si accadat credentem, intimis religionis actibus haud contentum, in externos exillire, ut puta administrationem susceptionemve Sacramentorum; necesse erit haec sub Status dominum cadere. Ecquid tum de ecclesiastica auctoritate? Cum haec nisi per externos actus non explicetur; Statui, tota quanta est, erit obnoxia. Hac nempe consecutione coacti, multi et protestantibus "liberalibus" cultum omnem sacrum externum, quin etiam externam quamlibet religiosam consociationem e medio tollunt, religionemque, ut aiunt, "individualem" invehere adnuntiant.—Quod si modernistae nondum ad haec palam progrediuntur, petunt interea ut Ecclesia quo ipsi impellunt sua se sponte inclinet seseque ad civiles formas aptet. Atque haec de auctoritate "disciplinari."—Nam de "doctrinali" et "dogmatica" potestate longe peiora sunt ac perniciosiora quae sentiunt. De magisterio Ecclesiae sic scilicet commentantur. Consociatio religiosa in unum vere coalescere nequaquam potest, nisi una sit consociatorum conscientia,

¹³ Prop. 2. "Propositio, quae statuit, potestatem a Deo datam Ecclesiae ut communicare tur Pastoribus, qui sunt eius ministri pro salute animarum; sic intellecta, ut a communitate fidelium in Pastores derivetur ecclesiastici ministerii ac regiminis potestas; haeretica."—Prop. 3. "Insuper, quae statuit Romanum Pontificem esse caput ministeriale; sic explicata ut Romanus Pontifex non a Christo in persona beati Petri, sed ab Ecclesia potestatem ministerii accipiat, qua velut Petri successor, verus Christi vicarius ac totius Ecclesiae caput pollet in universa Ecclesia: haeretica."

unaque, qua utantur, formula. Utraque autem haec unitas mentem quandam quasi communem expostulat, cuius sit reperire ac determinare formulam, quae communi conscientiae rectius respondeat; cui quidem menti satis auctoritatis inesse oportet ad formulam quam statuerit communitati imponendam. In hac porro coniunctione ac veluti fusione tum mentis formulam eligentis tum potestatis eandem perscrubentis, magisterii ecclesiastici notionem modernistae collocant. Cum igitur magisterium ex conscientiae singularibus tandem aliquando nascatur, et publicum officium in earumdem conscientiarum commodum mandatum habeat, consequitur necessario, illud ab eisdem conscientiis pendere, ac proinde ad populares formas esse inflectendum. Quapropter singularium hominum conscientias prohibere quominus impulsiones quas sentiunt palam aperteque profiteantur, et criticae viam praepedire qua dogma ad necessarias evolutiones impellat, potestatis ad utilitatem permissae non usus est sed abusus.—Similiter in usu ipso potestatis modus temperatioque sunt adhibenda. Librum quemlibet, auctore inscio, notare ac proscribere, nulla explicatione admissa, nulla disceptatione, tyrannidi profecto est proximum.—Quare haec etiam medium est quoddam iter reperiendum, ut auctoritati simul ac libertati integra sint iura. Interea temporis catholico sic est agendum, ut auctoritatis quidem observantissimum se publice profiteatur, suo tamen obsequi ingenio non intermittat.—Generatim vero sic de Ecclesia praescribunt: quoniam ecclesiasticae potestatis finis ad spiritualia unice pertinet; externum apparatus omnem esse tollendum, quo illa ad intuentium oculos magnificentius ornatur. In quo illud sane negligitur, religionem, etsi ad animos pertineat, non tamen unice animis concludi; et honorem potestati impensum in Christum institutorem recidere.

Porro ut totam hanc de fide deque vario eius germine materiam absolvamus, restat, Venerabiles Fratres, ut de utrorumque explicatione postremo loco modernistarum praecepta audiamus.—Principium hic generale est: in religione, quae vivat, nihil variabile non esse, atque ideo variandum. Hinc gressum faciunt ad illud, quod in eorum doctrinis fere caput est, videlicet ad "evolutionem." Dogma igitur, ecclesia, sacrorum cultus, libri, quos ut sanctos veremur, quin etiam fides ipsa, nisi intermortua haec omnia velimus, evolutionis teneri legibus debent. Neque hoc mirum videri queat, si ea prae oculis habeantur, quae sunt de horum singulis a modernistis tradita. Posita igitur evolutionis lege, evolutionis rationem a modernistis ipsis descriptam habemus. Et primo quoad fidem. Primigenia, inquit, fidei forma rudis et universis hominibus communis fuit, ut quae ex ipsa hominum natura atque vita oriebatur. Evolutio vitalis progressum dedit; nimirum non novitate formarum extrinsecus accedentium, sed ex perversione in dies auctiore sensus religiosi in conscientiam. Dupliciter autem progressio ipsa est facta: "negative" primum, elementum quodvis extraneum, ut puta ex familia vel gente adveniens, eliminando; dehinc "positive," intellectiva ac morali hominis expolitione, unde notio divini amplior ac lucidior "sensusque religiosus" exquisitor evasit. Progredientes vero fidei eadem sunt causae afferendae, quam quae superius sunt allatae ad eius originem explicandam. Quibus tamen extraordinarios quosdam homines addi oportet (quos nos prophetas appellamus, quorumque omnium praestantissimus est Christus); tum quia illi in vita ac sermonibus arcani quidpiam praesetulerunt, quod fides divinitati tribuebat; tum quia novas nec ante habitas "experientias" sunt nacti, religiosae cuiusque temporis indigentiae respondentes.—Dogmatis autem progressus inde potissimum enascitur, quod fidei impedimenta sint superanda, vincendi hostes, contradictiones refellendae. Adde his nimum quandam perpetuum ad melius penetranda quae in arcanis fidei continentur. Sic, ut exempla cetera praetereamus, de Christo factum est: in quo, divinum illud quaecumque, quod fides admittebat, ita pedetentim et gradatim amplificatum est, ut demum pro Deo haberetur.—Ad evolutionem cultus facit praecipue necessitas ad mores traditionesque populorum sese accomodandi; item quorundam virtute actum fruendi, quam sunt ex usu mutuati.—Tandem pro Ecclesia evolutionis causa inde oritur, quod componi egeat cum adiunctis historicis cumque civilis regiminis publice invecitis formis.—Sic illi de singulis. Hic autem, antequam procedamus, doctrina haec de "necessitatibus" seu "indigentis" (vulgo "dei bisogni" significantius appellant) probe ut notetur velimus; etenim, praeterquam omnium quae vidimus, est veluti basis ac fundamentum famosae illius methodi, quam historicam dicunt.

In evolutionis doctrina ut adhuc sistamus, illud praeterea est advertendum quod, etsi indigentiae seu necessitates ad evolutionem impellunt; his tamen unis acta, evolutio, transgressa facile traditionis fines atque ideo a primigenio vitali principio avulsa, ad ruinam potius quam ad progressionem traheret. Hinc, modernistarum mentem plenius sequuti, evolutionem ex confictione duarum virium evenire dicemus, quarum altera ad progressionem agit, altera ad conservationem retrahit.—Vis conservatrix viget in Ecclesia, contineturque traditione. Eam vero exerit religiosa auctoritas; idque tam iure ipso, est enim in auctoritatis natura traditionem tueri; tam

re, auctoritas namque, a commutationibus vitae reducta, stimulis ad progressionem pellentibus nihil aut vix urgetur. E contra vis ad progrediendum sapiens atque intimis indigentis respondens latet ac molitur in privatorum conscientiis, illorum praecipue qui vitam, ut inquit, propius atque intimius attingunt.—En hic, Venerabiles Fratres, doctrinam illam exitiosissimam efferre caput iam cernimus, quae laicos homines in Ecclesiam subinfert ut progressionis elementa.—Ex convento quodam et pacto inter binas hasce vires, conservatricem et progressionis fautricem, inter auctoritatem videlicet et conscientias privatorum, progressus ac mutationes oriuntur. Nam privatorum conscientiae, vel harum quaedam, in conscientiam collectivam agunt; haec vero in habentes auctoritatem, cogitque illos pactiones conflare atque in pacto manere.—Ex his autem pronum est intelligere, cur modernistae mirentur adeo, quum reprehendi se vel puniri sciunt. Quod eis culpa vertitur, ipsi pro officio habent religiose explendo. Necessitates conscientiarum nemo melius novit quam ipsi, eo quod propius illas attingunt, quam ecclesiastica auctoritas. Eas igitur necessitates omnes quasi in se colligunt; unde loquendi publice ac scribendi officio devinciuntur. Carpat eos, si volet, auctoritas; ipsi conscientia officii fulciuntur, intimaque experientia norunt non sibi repressiones deberi sed laudes. Utique non ipsos latet progressionem sine certaminibus haud fieri, nec sine victimis certamina: sint ergo ipsi pro victimis, sicut prophetae et Christus. Nec ideo quod male habentur, auctoritati invident: suum illam exsequi munus ultro concedunt. Queruntur tantum quod minime exaudiuntur; sic enim cursus animorum tardatur: hora tamen rumpendi moras certissime veniet, nam leges evolutionis coerceri possunt, infringi omnino non possunt. Instituto ergo itinere pergunt; pergunt, quamvis redarguti et damnati; incredibilem audaciam fucatae demissionis velamine obducunt. Cervices quidem simulate inflectunt; manu tamen atque animo quod susceperunt persequuntur audacius. Sic autem volentes omnino prudentesque agunt: tum quia tenent, auctoritatem stimulandam esse non evertendam; tum quia necesse illis est intra Ecclesiae septa manere, ut collectivam conscientiam sensim immutent: quod tamen quum aiunt, fateri se non advertunt conscientiam collectivam ab ipsis dissidere, atque ideo nullo eos iure illius se interpretes venditare.

Sic igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, modernistis auctoribus atque actoribus, nihil stabile nihil immutabile in Ecclesia esse oportet. Qua equidem in sententia praecursoribus non caruere, illis nimirum, de quibus Pius IX. decessor Noster iam scribebat: "Isti divinae revelationis inimici humanum progressum summis laudibus efferentes, in catholicam religionem temerario plane ac sacrilego ausu illum inducere vellent, perinde ac si ipsa religio non Dei, sed hominum opus esset aut philosophicum aliquid inventum, quod humanis modis perfici queat."¹⁴—De revelatione praesertim ac dogmate nulla doctrinae modernistarum novitas; sed eadem illa est, quam in Pii IX. syllabo reprobata reperimus, sic enunciatam: "Divina revelatio est imperfecta et idcirco subiecta continuo et indefinito progressui, qui humanae rationis progressioni respondeat."¹⁵ solemnius vero in Vaticana Synodo per haec verba: "Neque enim fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, velut philosophicum inventum proposita est humanis ingeniis perficienda, sed tamquam divinum depositum Christi sponsae tradita, fideliter custodienda et infallibiliter declaranda. Hinc sacrorum quoque dogmatum in sensu perpetuo esse retinendus, quem semel declaravit Sancta Mater Ecclesia, nec unquam ab eo sensu altioris intelligentiae specie et nomine recedendum."¹⁶ quo profecto explicatio nostrarum notionum, etiam circa fidem, tantum abest ut impediatur, ut imo adjuvetur ac provehatur. Quamobrem eadem Vaticana Synodus sequitur: "Crescat igitur et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiae, aetatum et saeculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia; sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia."¹⁷

Sed postquam in modernismi assectatoribus philosophum, credentem, theologum observavimus, iam nunc restat ut pariter historicum, criticum, apologetam, reformatorem spectemus.

Modernistarum quidam, qui componendis historiis se dedunt, solliciti magnopere videntur ne credantur philosophi; profitentur quum immo philosophiae se penitus expertes esse. Astute id quam quod maxime: ne scilicet culpam sit opinio, eos praeiudicatis imbui philosophiae opinionibus, nec esse propterea, ut aiunt, omnino "objectivos." Verum tamen est, historiam illorum aut criticen meram loqui philosophiam; quaeque ab iis inferuntur, ex philosophicis eorum principiis iusta ratiocinatione concludi.

¹⁴ Encycl. "Qui pluribus," 9 Nov. 1846.

¹⁵ Syll. Prop. 5.

¹⁶ Const. "Dei Filius," cap. iv.

¹⁷ Loc. cit.

Quod equidem facile consideranti patet.—Primi tres huiusmodi historicorum aut criticorum canones, ut diximus, eadem illa sunt principia, quae supra ex philosophis attulimus: nimirum "agnosticismus," theorema de "transfiguratione" rerum per fidem, itemque aliud quod de "defiguratione" dici posse visum est. Iam consecutiones ex singulis notemus.—Ex "agnosticismo" historia, non aliter ac scientia, unice de phaenomenis est. Ergo tam Deus quam quilibet in humanis divinus interventus ad fidem reiiciendus est, utpote ad illam pertinens unam. Quapropter si quid occurrat duplici constans elemento, divino atque humano, cuiusmodi sunt Christus, Ecclesia, Sacramenta aliaque id genus multa; sic partiendum erit ac secernendum, ut quod humanum fuerit historiae, quod divinum tribuatur fidei. Ideo vulgata apud modernistas discretio inter Christum historicum et Christum fidei, Ecclesiam historiae et Ecclesiam fidei, Sacramenta historiae et Sacramenta fidei, allaque similia passim.—Deinde hoc ipsum elementum humanum, quod sibi historicum sumere videmus, quale illud in monumentis apparet, a fide per "transfigurationem" ultra conditiones historicae elatum dicendum est. Adiectiones igitur a fide factas rursus secernere oportet, easque ad fidem ipsam amandare atque ad historiam fidei: sic, quum de Christo agitur, quidquid conditionem hominis superat, sive naturalem, prout a psychologia exhibetur, sive ex loco atque aetate, quibus ille vixit, conflatur.—Praeterea, ex tertio philosophiae principio, res etiam, quae historiae ambitum non excedunt, cribro veluti cernunt, eliminantque omnia ac pariter ad fidem amandant quae ipsorum iudicio, in factorum "logica," ut inquit, non sunt vel personis apta non fuerint. Sic volunt Christum ea non dixisse, quae audientis vulgi captum excedere videntur. Hinc de "reali" eius historia delent et fidei permittunt allegorias omnes quae in sermonibus eius occurrunt. Quaeremus forsitan qua lege haec segregentur? Ex ingenio hominis, ex conditione qua sit in civitate usus, ex educatione, ex adiunctorum facti cuiusquam complexu: uno verbo, si bene novimus, ex norma quae tandem aliquando in mere "subjectivam" recidit. Nituntur scilicet Christi personam ipsi capere et quasi gerere: quidquid vero paribus in adiunctis ipsi fuissent acturi, id omne in Christum transferunt.—Sic agitur, ut concludamus, "a priori" et ex quibusdam philosophiae principiis, quam tenent quidem sed ignorare asserunt, in "reali," quam vocant, historia Christum Deum non esse affirmant nec quidquam divini egisse; ut hominem vero ea tantum patrasse aut dixisse, quae ipsi, ad illius se tempora referentes, patrandi aut dicendi ius tribuunt.

Ut autem historia ab philosophia, sic critica ab historia suas accipit conclusiones. Criticus namque, indicia sequutus ab historico praebita, monumenta partitur bifariam. Quidquid post dictam triplicem obtruncationem superat, "reali" historiae assignat; cetera ad fidei historiam seu "internam" ablegat. Has enim binas historias accurate distinguunt; et historiam fidei, quod bene notatum volumus, historias "reali" ut realis est opponunt. Hinc, ut iam diximus, geminus Christus; realis alter, alter qui nunquam reapse fuit sed ad fidem pertinet: alter qui certo loco certaue vixit aetate, alter qui solummodo in piis commentationibus fidei reperitur: ieiunmodi, exempli causa, est Christus, quem Ioannis evangelium exhibet; quod utique, aiunt, totum quantum est commentatio est.

Verum non his philosophiae in historiam dominatus absolvitur. Monumentis, ut diximus, bifariam distributis, adest iterum philosophus cum suo dogmate "vitalis immanentiae;" atque omnia edicit, quae sunt in ecclesiae historia, per "vitalem emanationem" esse explicanda. Atqui vitalis cuiuscumque emanationis aut causae aut conditio est in necessitate seu indigentia quapiam ponenda: ergo et factum post necessitatem concipi oportet, et illud historice huic esse posterius.—Quid tum historicus? Monumenta iterum, sive quae in libris sacris continentur sive aliunde adducta, scrutatus, indicem ex his conficit singularum necessitatum, tum ad dogma tum ad cultum sacrorum tum ad alia spectantium, quae in Ecclesia, altera ex altera, locum habuere. Confectum indicem critico tradit. Hic vero ad monumenta, quae fidei historiae destinantur, manum admovet; illaque per aetates singulas sic disponit, ut dato indici respondeant singula: eius semper praecepti memor, factum necessitate, narrationem facto anteverti. Equidem fieri aliquando possit, quasdam Bibliorum partes, ut puta epistolas, ipsum esse factum a necessitate creatum. Quidquid tamen sit, lex est, monumenti cuiuslibet aetatem non aliter determinandam esse, quam ex aetate exortae in Ecclesia uniuscuiusque necessitatis.—Distinguendum praeterea est inter facti cuiuspiam exordium eiusdemque explicationem: quod enim uno die nasci potest, non nisi decursu temporis incrementa suscipit. Hanc ob causam debet criticus monumenta, per aetates, ut diximus, iam distributa bipartiri iterum, altera quae ad originem rei altera quae ad explicationem pertineant secernens; eaque rursus ordinare per tempora.

Tum denuo philosopho locus est; qui iniungit historico sua studia sic exercere, uti evolutionis praecepta legesque praescribunt. Ad haec historicus monumenta iterum scrutari; inquirere curiose in adiuncta condi-

tionisque, quibus Ecclesia per singulas aetates sit usa, in eius vim conservatricem, in necessitates tam internas quam externas quae ad progrediendum impellerent, in impedimenta quae obfuerunt, uno verbo, in ea quaecumque quae ad determinandum faxint quo pacto evolutionis leges fuerint servatae. Post haec tandem explicationis historiam, per extrema veluti "lineamenta," describit. Succurrit criticus aptatque monumenta reliqua. Ad scriptionem adhibetur manus: historia confecta est.—Cui iam, petimus, haec historia inscribenda? Historico ne an critico? Neutri profecto; sed philosopho. Tota ibi per "apriorismum" res agitur: et quidem per apriorismum haeresibus scatentem. Miseret sane hominum eiusmodi de quibus Apostolus diceret: "Evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis . . . dicentes enim se esse sapientes, stulti facti sunt:"¹⁸ ad bilem tamen commovent quum Ecclesiam criminantur monumenta sic permiscere ac temperare ut suae utilitati loquantur. Nimirum affligunt Ecclesiae, quod sua sibi conscientia apertissime improbari sentiunt.

Ex illa porro monumentorum per aetates partitione ac dispositione sequitur sua sponte non posse libros sacros iis auctoribus tribui, quibus reapse inscribuntur. Quam ob causam modernistae passim non dubitant asserere, illos eosdem libros, Pentateuchum praesertim ac prima tria Evangelia, ex brevi quadam primigenia narratione, crevisse gradatim accessionibus, interpositionibus nempe in modum interpretationis sive theologiae sive allegoricae, vel etiam iniectis ad diversa solummodo inter se iungenda.—Nimirum, ut paucis clariusque dicamus, admittenda est "vitalis evolutio" librorum sacrorum, nata, ex evolutione fidei eidemque respondens.—Addunt vero, huius evolutionis vestigia adeo esse manifesta, ut illius fere historia describi possit. Quin immo et reapse describunt, tam non dubitanter, ut suis ipsis oculis vidisse crederes scriptores singulos, qui singulis aetatibus ad libros sacros amplificandos admovent manum.—Haec autem ut confirmant, critice, quam "textualem" nominant, adiutricem appellant; nitunturque persuadere hoc vel illud factum aut dictum non suo esse loco, aliasque eiusmodi rationes proferunt. Diceres profecto eos narrationum aut sermonum quosdam quasi typos praestituisse sibi unde certissime iudicent quid suo quid alieno stet loco.—Hac via qui apti esse queant ad decernendum, aestimet qui volet. Verumtamen qui eos audiât de suis exercitationibus circa sacros libros affirmantes, unde tot ibi incongrue notata datum est deprehendere, credet fere nullum ante ipsos hominum eosdem libros volutasse, neque hosinfinitam propemodum Doctorum multitudinem quaquaversus rimatum esse, ingenio plane et eruditione et sanctitudine vitae longe illis praestantiorem. Qui equidem Doctores sapientissimi tantum abfuit ut Scripturas sacras ulla ex parte reprehenderent, ut immo, quo illas scrutabantur penitus, eo maiores divino Numini agerent gratias, quod ita cum hominibus loqui dignatum esset. Sed heu! non iis adiumentis Doctores nostri in sacros libros incubuerunt, quibus modernistae! scilicet magistratam et ducem non habuere philosophiam, quae initia duceret a negatione Dei, nec se ipsi iudicandi normam sibi delegerunt.—Iam igitur patere arbitramur, cuiusmodi in re historica modernistarum sit methodus. Praeit philosophus; illum historicus excipit; pone ex ordine legunt critice tum interna tum textualis. Et quia primae causae hoc competit ut virtutem suam cum sequentibus communicet, evidens fit, critice eiusmodi non quampiam esse critice, sed vocari iure "agnosticam, immanentistam, evolutionistam;" atque ideo, qui eam profitetur eaque utitur, errores eidem implicitos profiteri et catholicae doctrinae adversari.—Quam ob rem mirum magnopere videri possit, apud catholicos homines id genus critices adeo hodie valere. Id nempe geminam habet causam: foedus in primis, quo historici criticique huius generis arctissime inter se iunguntur, varietate gentium ac religionum dissensione posthabita: tum vero audacia maxima, qua, quae quisque effutiat, ceteri uno ore extollunt et scientiae progressioni tribuunt; qua, qui novum portentum aestimare per se volet, facto agmine adoriuntur; qui neget, ignorantiae accusent; qui amplectitur ac tuetur, laudibus exornant. Inde haud pauci decepti; qui, si rem attentius considerarent, horrerent.—Ex hoc autem praepotenti errantium dominio, ex hac levium animorum incauta assensione quaedam circumstantiis aëris quasi corruptio gignitur, quae per omnia permeat luemque diffundit.—Sed ad apologetam transeamus.

Hic apud modernistas dupliciter a philosopho et ipse pendet. "Non directe" primum, materiam sibi sumens historiam, philosopho, ut vidimus, praecipiente conscriptam: "directe" dein, mutuatus ab illo dogmata ac iudicia. Inde illud vulgatum in schola modernistarum praeceptum, debere novam apologetam controversias de religione dirimere historicis inquisitionibus et psychologicis. Quamobrem apologetae modernistae suum opus aggrediuntur rationalistas monendo, se religionem vindicare non sacris libris neve ex historiis vulgo in Ecclesia adhibitis, quae veteri methodo descriptae sint; sed ex historia "reali," modernis praeceptionibus

¹⁸ Ad Rom. 1, 21 e 22.

modernaque methodo conflata. Idque non quasi "ad hominem" argumentati asserunt, sed quia reapse hanc tantum historiam vera tradere arbitrantur. De adserenda vero sua in scribendo sinceritate securi sunt: iam apud rationalistas noti sunt, iam, ut sub eodem vexillo stipendia merentes, laudati: de qua laudatione, quam verus catholicus respueret, ipsi sibi gratulantur, eamque reprehensionibus Ecclesiae opponunt.—Sed iam quo pacto apologetis unus aliquis istorum perficiat videamus. Finis, quem sibi assequendum praestituit, hic est: hominem fidei adhuc expertem eo adducere, ut eam de catholica religione "experientiam" assequatur, quae ex modernistarum scitis unicum fidei est fundamentum. Geminum ad hoc petet iter: "objectivum" alterum, alterum "subiectivum." Primum ex agnosticismis procedit; eoque spectat, ut eam in religione, praesertim catholica, vitalem virtutem inesse monstret, quae psychologum quemque itemque historicum bonae mentis suadeat, oportere in illius historia "incogniti" aliquid celari. Ad hoc, ostendere necessum est, catholicam religionem, quae modo est, eam omnino esse quam Christus fundavit, seu non aliud prater progredientem eius germinis explicationem, quod Christus inexit. Primo igitur germen illud quale sit, determinandum. Idipsum porro hac formula exhiberi volunt; Christum adventum regni Dei nunciasse, quod brevi foret constituendum, eiusque ipsum fore Messiam, actorem nempe divinitus datum atque ordinatorem. Post haec demonstrandum, quia ratione id germen, semper "immanens" in catholica religione ac "permanens," sensim ac secundum historiam sese evolverit aptarumque succedentibus adiunctis, ex iis ad se "vitaliter" trahens quidquid doctrinalium, cultualium, ecclesiasticarum formarum sibi esset utile; interea vero impedimenta si quae occurrerent superans, adversarios profligans, insectationibus quibusvis pugnisque superstes. Postquam autem haec omnia, impedimenta nimirum, adversarios, insectationes, pugnas, itemque vitam foecunditatemque Ecclesiae id genus fuisse monstratum fuerit, ut, quamvis evolutionis leges in eiusdem Ecclesiae historia incolumes appareant, non tamen eidem historiae plene explicandae sint pares; "incognitum" coram stabit, suaque sponte se offeret.—Sic illi. In qua tota ratiocinatione unum tamen non advertunt, determinationem illam germinis primigenii debere unice "apriorismo" philosophi agnostici et evolutionistae, et germen ipsum sic gratis ab eis defini ut eorum causae congruat.

Dum tamen catholicam religionem recitatis argumentationibus asserere ac suadere elaborant apologetae novi, dant ultro et concedunt, plura in ea esse quae animos offendant. Quin etiam, non obscura quadam voluptate, in re quoque dogmatica errores contradictionesque reperire se palam dicunt: subdunt tamen, haec non solum admittere excusationem, sed, quod mirum esse oportet, iuste ac legitime esse prolata. Sic etiam, secundum ipsos, in sacris libris, plurima in re scientifica vel historica errore afficiuntur. Sed, inquit, non ibi de scientiis agi aut historia, verum de religione tantum ac re morum. Scientiae illic et historia integumenta sunt quaedam, quibus experientiae religiosae et morales obteguntur ut facilius in vulgus propagarentur; quod quidem vulgus cum non aliter intelligeret, perfectior illi scientia aut historia non utilitati sed nocumento fuisset. Ceterum, addunt, libri sacri, quia natura sunt religiosi, vitam necessario vivunt: iam vitae sua quoque est veritas et logica, alia profecto a veritate et logica rationali, quin immo alterius omnino ordinis, veritas scilicet comparationis ac proportionis tum ad "medium" (sic ipsi dicunt) in quo vivitur, tum ad finem ob quem vivitur. Demum eo usque progrediuntur ut, nulla adhibita temperatione, asserant, quidquid per vitam explicatur, id omne verum esse ac legitimum.—Nos equidem, Venerabiles Fratres, quibus una atque unica est veritas, quae sacros libros sic aestimamus "quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem,"¹⁹ hoc idem esse affirmamus ac mendacium utilitatis seu officiosum ipsi Deo tribuere; verbisque Augustini asserimus: "Admisso semel in tantum auctoritatis fastigium officioso aliquo mendacio, nulla illorum librorum particula remanebit, quae non ut cuique videbitur vel ad mores difficilis vel ad fidem incredibilis, eadem perniciosissima regula ad mentientis auctoris consilium officiumque referatur."²⁰ Unde fiet quod idem sanctus Doctor adiungit: "In eis," scilicet Scripturis, "quod vult quisque credet, quod non vult non credet."—Sed modernistae apologetae progrediuntur alacres. Concedunt praeterea, in sacris libris eas subinde ratiocinationes occurrere ad doctrinam quampiam probandam, quae nullo rationali fundamento regantur; cuiusmodi sunt quae in prophetiis nituntur. Verum has quoque defendunt quasi artificia quaedam praedicationis, quae a vita legitima fiunt. Quid amplius? Permittunt, immo vero asserunt, Christum ipsum in indicando tempore adventus regni Dei manifeste errasse: neque id mirum, inquit, videri debet; nam et ipse vitae legibus tenbatur!—Quid post haec de Ecclesiae dogmatibus? Scatent haec etiam apertis oppositionibus: sed, praeterquamquod a logica vitali admit-

¹⁹ Conc. Vat. "De Rev.," c. ii.

²⁰ Epist. 28.

tuntur, veritati symbolicae non adversantur; in iis quippe de infinito agitur cuius infiniti sunt respectus. Demum, adeo haec omnia probant tuenturque, ut proferri non dubitent, nullum Infinito honorem haberi excellentiorem quam contradicentia de ipso affirmando!—Probata vero contradictione, quid non probabitur?

Attamen qui nondum credat non "obiectivis" solum argumentis ad fidem disponi potest, verum etiam "subiectivis." Ad quem finem modernistae apologetae ad "immanentiae" doctrinam revertuntur. Elaborant nempe ut homini persuadeant, in ipso atque in intimis eius naturae ac vitae recessibus celari cuiuspiam religionis desiderium et exigentiam, nec religionis cuiuscumque sed talis omnino qualis catholica est; hanc enim "postulari" prorsus inquit ab explicatione vitae perfecta.—Hic autem queri vehementer. Nos iterum oportet, non desiderari e catholicis hominibus, qui, quamvis "immanentiae" doctrinam ut doctrinam reiciunt, ea tamen pro apologesi utuntur; idque adeo incauti faciunt, ut in natura humana non capacitatem solum et convenientiam videantur admittere ad ordinem supernaturalem, quod quidem apologetae catholici opportunis adhibitis temperationibus demonstrarunt semper, sed germanam verique nominis exigentiam.—Ut tamen verius dicamus, haec catholicae religionis exigentia a modernistis invehitur, qui volunt moderatores audiri. Nam qui "integralistae" appellari queunt, ii homini nondum credenti ipsum germen, in ipso latens, demonstrari volunt, quod in Christi conscientia fuit atque ab eo hominibus transmissum est.—Sic igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, apologeticam modernistarum methodum, summam descriptam, doctrinis eorum plane congruentem agnoscimus: methodum profecto, uti etiam doctrinas, errorum plenas, non ad aedificandum aptas sed ad destruendum, non ad catholicos efficiendos sed ad catholicos ipsos ad haeresim trahendos, immo etiam ad religionis cuiuscumque omnimodam eversionem!

Pauca demum superant addenda de modernista ut reformator est. Iam ea, quae huc usque loquuti sumus, abunde manifestant quanto et quam acri innovandi studio hi homines ferantur. Pertinet autem hoc studium ad res omnino omnes, quae apud catholicos sunt.—Innovari volunt philosophiam in sacris praesertim Seminariis: ita ut, amandata philosophia scholasticorum ad historiam philosophiae inter cetera quae iam obsoleverunt systemata, adolescentibus moderna tradatur philosophia, quae una vera nostraeque aetati respondens.—Ad theologiam innovandam, volunt, quam nos rationale dicimus, habere fundamentum modernam philosophiam. Positivam vero theologiam, niti maxime postulant in historia dogmatum.—Historiam quoque scribi et tradi expetunt ad suam methodum praescriptaque moderna.—Dogmata eorumdemque evolutionem cum scientia et historia componenda edicunt.—Ad catechesim quod spectat, ea tantum in catecheticis libris notari postulant dogmata, quae innovata fuerint sintque ad vulgi captum.—Circa sacrorum cultum, minuendas inquit externas religiones prohibendumve ne crescant. Quamvis eisdem alii, qui symbolismo magis favent, in hac re indulgentiores se praebeant.—Regimen ecclesiae omni sub respectu reformandum clamitant, praecipue tamen sub disciplinari ac dogmatico. Ideo intus forisque cum moderna, ut aiunt, conscientia componendum, quae tota ad democratiam vergit: ideo inferiori clero ipsisque laicis suae in regimine partes tribuendae, et collecta nimium contractaque in centrum auctoritas dispertienda.—Romana consilia sacris negotiis gerendis immutari pariter volunt; in primis autem tum quod a "sancto officio" tum quod ab "indice" appellatur.—Item ecclesiastici regiminis actionem in re politica et sociali variandam contendunt, ut simul a civilibus ordinationibus exulet, eisdem tamen se aptet ut suo illas spiritu imbuat.—In re morum, illud asciscunt americanistarum scitum, activas virtutes passivis anteponi oportere, atque illas prae istis exercitatione promoveri.—Clerum sic comparatum petunt ut veterem referat demissionem animi et paupertatem; cogitatione insuper et facto cum modernismi praeceptis consentiat.—Sunt demum qui, magistris protestantibus dicto lubentissime audientes, sacrum ipsum in sacerdotio coelibatum sublatum desiderant.—Quid igitur in Ecclesia intactum relinquunt, quod non ab ipsis nec secundum ipsorum pronuntiata sit reformandum?

In tota hac modernistarum doctrina exponenda, Venerabiles Fratres, videbimur forte alicui diutius immorati. Id tamen omnino oportuit, tum ne, ut assolet, de ignorance rerum suarum ab illis reprehendamus; tum ut pateat, quum de modernismo est quaestio, non de vagis doctrinis agi nulloque inter se nexu coniunctis, verum de uno compactoque veluti corpore, in quo si unum admittas, cetera necessario sequantur. Ideo didactica fere ratione usi sumus, nec barbara aliquando respuimus verba, quae modernistae usurpant.—Iam systema universum uno quasi obtutu respicientes, nemo mirabitur si sic illud definimus, ut omnium haereseon conlectum esse affirmemus. Certe si quis hoc sibi proposuisset, omnium quotquot fuerunt circa fidem errores succum veluti ac sanguinem in unum conferre; rem nunquam plenius perfecisset, quam modernistae perfecerunt. Immo vero tanto hi ulterius progressi sunt, ut, non modo catholicam religionem, sed

omnen penitus, quod iam innuimus, religionem deleverint. Hinc enim rationalistarum plausus: hinc qui liberius apertiusque inter rationalistas loquuntur, nullos se efficaciores quam modernistas auxiliores invenisse gratulantur.—Redeamus enimvero tantisper, Venerabiles Fratres, ad exitosissimam illam "agnosticismi" doctrinam. Eâ scilicet, ex parte intellectus, omnis ad Deum via praecluditur homini, dum aptior sterni putatur ex parte cuiusdam animi sensus et actionis. Sed hoc quam perperam, quis non videat? Sensus enim animi actioni rei respondet, quam intellectus vel externi sensus proposuerint. Demito intellectum; homo externos sensus, ad quos iam fertur, proclivius sequetur. Perperam iterum; nam phantasiae quaevis de sensu religioso communem sensum non expugnabunt; communi autem sensu docemur, perturbationem aut occupationem animi quampiam, non adiumento sed impedimento esse potius ad investigationem veri, veri iniquius ut in se est; nam verum illud alterum "subiectivum," fructus interni sensus et actionis, si quidem ludendo esse aptum, nihil admodum homini confert, cuius scire maxime interest sit necne extra ipsum Deus, cuius in manus aliquando incidet.—"Experientiam" enimvero tanto operi adiutricem inferunt. Sed quid haec ad sensum illum animi adiciat? Nil plane, praeterquam quod vehementiorem faciat; ex qua vehementia fiat proportione firmiter persuasio de veritate obiecti. Iam haec duo profecto non efficiunt ut sensus ille animi desinat esse sensus, neque eius immutant naturam, semper deceptioni obnoxiam, nisi regatur intellectus; immo vero illam confirmant et iuvant, nam sensus quo intensior, eo potiore iure est sensus.—Cum vero de religioso sensu hic agamus deque experientia in eo contenta. nostis probe, Venerabiles Fratres, quanta in hac re prudentia sit opus, quanta item doctrina quae ipsam regat prudentiam. Nostis ex animorum usu, quorundam praecipue in quibus eminent sensus; nostis ex librorum consuetudine, qui de ascési tractant; qui quamvis modernisti in nullo sunt pretio, doctrinam tamen longe solidiorem, subtilioremque ad observandum sagacitatem praeseferunt, quam ipsi sibi arrogat. Equidem Nobis amentis esse videtur aut saltem imprudentis summopere pro veris, nulla facta investigatione, experientias intimas habere, eiusmodi modernistae venditant. Cur vero, ut per transcursum dicamus, si harum experientiarum tanta vis est ac firmitas, non eadem tribuatur illi, quam plura catholicorum millia se habere asserunt de devio itinere, quo modernistae incedunt? Haec ne tantum falsa atque fallax? Hominum autem pars maxima hoc firmiter tenet tenebitque semper, sensu solum et experientia, nullo mentis ductu atque lumine, ad Dei notitiam pertingi nunquam posse. Restat ergo iterum atheismus ac religio nulla.—Nec modernistae meliora sibi promittant ex asserta "symbolismi" doctrina. Nam si quaevis intellectuala, ut iniqui, elementa nihil nisi Dei symbola sunt; ecquid symbolum non sit ipsum Dei nomen aut personalitatis divinae? quod si ita, iam de divina personalitate ambigi poterit, patetque ad pantheismum via.—Eodem autem, videlicet ad purum putumque pantheismum, ducit doctrina alia de "immanentia divina." Etenim hoc quaerimus: an eiusmodi "immanentia" Deum ab homine distinguat necne. Si distinguit, quid tum a catholica doctrina differt, aut doctrinam de externa revelatione cur reicit? Si non distinguit, pantheismum habemus. Atqui "immanentia" haec modernistarum vult atque admittit omne conscientiae phaenomenon ab homine ut homo est proficisci. Legitima ergo ratiocinatio inde infert unum idemque esse Deum cum homine: ex eo quo pantheismus.—Distinctio demum, quam praedicant, inter scientiam et fidem, non aliam admittit consecutionem. Obiectum enim scientiae in cognoscibilis realitate ponunt; fidei e contra in incognoscibilis. Iam vero incognoscibile inde omnino constituitur, quod inter obiectam materiam et intellectum nulla adsit proportio. Atqui hic proportionis defectus nunquam, nec in modernistarum doctrina, auferri potest. Ergo incognoscibile credenti aequae ac philosopho incognoscibile semper manebit. Ergo si qua habebitur religio, haec erit realitatis incognoscibilis; quae cur etiam mundi animus esse nequeat, quem rationalistae quidam admittunt, non videmus profecto.—Sed haec modo sufficiant ut abunde pateat quam multiplex itinere doctrina modernistarum ad atheismum trahat et ad religionem omnem abolendam. Equidem protestantium error primus hac via gradum iecit; sequitur modernistarum error; proxime atheismus ingreditur.

Ad penitentiorem modernismi notitiam, et ad tanti vulneris remedia aptius quaerenda, iuvat nunc, Venerabiles Fratres, causas aliquantum scrutari unde sit ortum aut, nutritum malum.—Proximam continentemque causam in errore mentis esse ponendam, dubitationem non habet. Remotas vero binas agnoscamus, curiositatem et superbiam.—Curiositas, ni sapienter cohibeatur, sufficit per se una ad quoscumque explicandos errores. Unde Gregorius XVI. decessor Noster iure scribebat:²¹ "Lugendum valde est quoniam erolabantur humanae rationis deliramenta, ubi quis novis rebus studeat, atque contra Apostoli monitum nitatur plus sapere quam oporteat

²¹ Ep. Encycl., "Singulari Nos," 7 kal. iul. 1834.

sapere, sibi quae nimium praefidens, veritatem quaerendam autemet extra catholicam Ecclesiam, in qua absque vel levissimo erroris coeno ipsa invenitur.—Sed longe maiorem ad obcaecandum animum et in errorem inducendum cohibet efficientiam superbia: quae in modernismi doctrina quasi in domicilio collocata: ex ea undequaque alimenta concipit, omnesque induit aspectus. Superbia enim sibi audacius praefidit, ut tamquam universorum normam se ipsi habeant ac proponant. Superbia vanissime gloriantur quasi uni sapientiam possideant, dicuntque elati atque inflati: "Non sumus sicut ceteri homines;" et ne cum ceteris comparentur, nova quaeque etsi absurdissima amplectuntur et somniant. Superbia sublectionem omnem abiciunt contenduntque auctoritatem cum libertate componendam. Superbia sui ipsorum obliti, de aliorum reformatione unice cogitant, nullaque est apud ipsos gradus, nulla vel supremæ potestatis reverentia. Nulla profecto brevior et expeditior ad modernismum est via, quam superbia. Si qui catholicus e laicorum coetu, si quis etiam sacerdos christianæ vitæ præcepti sit immemor, quo iubemur abnegare nos ipsi si Christum sequi velimus, nec auferat superbiam de corde suo; nae is ad modernistarum errores amplectendos aptissimus est quam qui maxime!—Quare, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc primum vobis officium esse oportet superbiæ eiusmodi hominibus obistere, eos tenuioribus atque obscurioribus muneribus occupare, ut eo amplius deprimantur quo se tollunt altius et ut, humiliore loco positi, minus habeant ad nocendum potestatis. Præterea tum ipsi per vos tum per seminariorum moderatores, alumnos sacri cleri scrutemini diligentissime; et si quos superbo ingenio repperitis, eos fortissime a sacerdotio repellatis. Quod utinam peractum semper fuisset ea qua opus erat vigilantia et constantia!

Quod si a moralibus causis ad eas quae ab intellectu sunt veniamus, prima atque pessima occurret ignorantia.—Enimvero modernistæ, quotquot sunt, qui doctores in Ecclesia esse ac videri volunt, modernam philosophiam plenis buccis extollentes aspernatque scholasticam, non aliter illam, eius fuco et fallacis decepti, sunt amplexi, quam quod alteram ignorantes persus, omni argumento caruerunt ad notionum confusionem tollendam et ad sophismata refellendam. Ex connubio autem falsæ philosophiæ cum fide illorum systema, tot tantisque erroribus abundans, ortum habuit.

Cui propagando utinam minus studii et curarum impenderent! Sed eorum tanta est alacritas, adeo indefessus labor, ut plane pigeat tantas insuui vires ad Ecclesiæ perniciem, quae, si recte adhibeat, summo forent adiumento.—Gemina vero ad fallendos animos utuntur arte; primum enim complanare quae obstant nituntur, tum autem quae prosint studiosissime perquirunt atque impigre patientissimeque adhibent.—Tria sunt potissimum quae suis illi conatibus adversari sentiunt: scholastica philosophandi methodus, Patrum auctoritas et traditio, magisterium ecclesiasticum. Contra hæc acerrima illorum pugna. Idcirco philosophiam ac theologiam scholasticam derident passim atque contemnunt. Sive id ex ignorantione faciunt sive ex metu, sive potius ex utraque causa, certum est studium novarum rerum cumodio scholasticæ methodi coniungi semper; nullumque est indicium manifestius quod quis modernismi doctrinis favere incipiat, quam quum incipit scholasticam horrere methodum. Meminerint modernistæ ac modernistarum studiosi damnationem, qua Pius IX. censuit reprobendam propositionem quae diceret:²² "Methodus et principia, quibus antiqui doctores scholastici theologiam excoluerunt, temporum nostrorum necessitatibus scientiarumque progressui minime congruunt."—Traditionis vero vim et naturam callidissime pervertere elaborant, ut illius monumentum ac pondus elidant. Stabit tamen semper catholicis auctoritas Nicaenæ Synodi II., quae damnavit "eos, qui audent . . . secundum scelestos hæreticos ecclesiasticas traditiones spernere et novitate quamlibet excogitare . . . aut excogitare prave aut astute ad subvertendum quidquam ex legitimis traditionibus Ecclesiæ catholiciæ." Stabit Synodi Constantinopolitanae IV. professio: "Igitur regulas, quae sanctæ catholiciæ et apostoliciæ Ecclesiæ tam a sanctis famosissimis Apostolis, quam ab orthodoxorum universalibus necnon et localibus Conciliis vel etiam a quolibet deo loquo Patre ac magistro Ecclesiæ traditæ sunt, servare ac custodire profitemur." Unde Romani Pontifices Pius IV. itemque huius nominis IX. in professione fidei hæc quoque addi voluerunt: "Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque eiusdem Ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector."—Nec secus quam de Traditione, iudicant modernistæ de sanctissimis Ecclesiæ Patribus. Eos temeritate summa traducunt vulgo ut omni quidem cultu dignissimos, ast in re critica et historica ignorantiae summæ, quae, nisi ab ætate qua vixerunt, excusationem non habeat.—Denique ipsius ecclesiastici magisterii auctoritatem toto studio minuere atque infirmare conantur, tum eius originem, naturam, lura sacrilege pervertendo, tum contra illam adver-

²² Syll. prop. 13.

²³ Motu pr. "Ut mysticam," 14 martii 1891.

sariorum calumnias libere ingeminando. Valent enim de modernistarum grege, quae moerore summo Decessor Noster scribebat: "Ut mysticam Sponsam Christi, qui lux vera est, in contemptum et invidiam vocarent tenebrarum filii consuevere in vulgus eam vecordi calumnia impetere, et, conversa rerum nominumque ratione et vi, compellare obscuritatis amicam, altricem ignorantiae, scientiarum lumini et progressui infensam."²³—Quae cum sint ita, Venerabiles Fratres, mirum non est, si catholicos homines, qui strenue pro Ecclesia decertant, summa malevolentia et livore modernistae impetunt. Nullum est iniuriarum genus, quo illos non lacerent: sed ignorantiae passim pervicaciaeque accusant. Quod si refellentium eruditio-nem et vim pertimescant: efficaciam derogant coniurato silentio. Quae quidem agendi ratio cum catholicis eo plus habet invidiae, quod, eodem tempore nulloque modo adhibito, perpetuis laudibus evehunt quotquot cum ipsis consentiunt; horum libros nova undique spirantes grandi plausu excipiunt ac suspiciunt; quo quis audentius vetera evertit, traditionem et magisterium ecclesiasticum respuit, eo sapientiores praedicant; denique, quod quisque bonus horreat, si quem Ecclesia damnatione perculerit, hunc, facto agmine, non solum palam et copiosissime laudant, sed ut veritatis martyrem pene venerantur.—Toto hoc, tum laudationum tum impropiorum strepitu, percussae ac turbatae iuniorum mentes, hinc ne ignorantem audiant inde ut sapientes videantur, cogente intus curiositate ac superbia, dant victas saepe manus ac modernismo se dedunt.

Sed iam ad artificia haec pertinent, quibus modernistae merces suas vendunt. Quid enim non moluntur ut assecularum numerum augeant? In sacris Seminariis, in Universitatibus studiorum magisteria aucupantur, quae sensim in pestilentiae cathedras vertunt. Doctrinas suas, etsi forte implicite, in templis ad concionem dicentes inculcant; apertius in congressibus enunciant; in socialibus institutis intrudunt atque extollunt. Libros, ephemeridas, commentaria suo vel alieno nomine edunt. Unus aliquando idemque scriptor multiplici nomine utitur, ut simulata auctorum multitudine incauti decipiantur. Brevi, actione, verbis, proelo nihil non tentant, ut eos febrim quadam phreneticos diceret.—Haec autem omnia quo fructu? Iuvenes magno numero deflemus, egregiae quidem illos spei, quique Ecclesiae utilitatibus optimam navarent operam, a recto tramite deflexisse. Plurimos etiam dolemus, qui, quamvis non eo processerint, tamen corrupto quasi aëre hausto, laxius ad modum cogitare, eloqui, scribere consuescunt quam catholicos decet. Sunt hi de laicorum coetu, sunt etiam de sacerdotum numero; nec, quod minus fuisset expectandum, in ipsis religiosorum familiis desiderantur. Rem biblicam ad modernistarum leges tractant. In conscribendis historiis, specie adserendae veritatis, quidquid Ecclesiae maculam videtur aspergere, id, manifesta quadam voluptate, in lucem diligentissime ponunt. Sacras populares traditiones, apriorismo quodam ducti, delere omni ope conantur. Sacras Reliquias vetustate commendatas despectui habent. Vano scilicet desiderio feruntur ut mundus de ipsis loquatur; quod futurum non autumant si ea tantum dicant, quae semper quaeve ab omnibus sunt dicta. Interea suadent forte sibi obsequium se praestare Deo et Ecclesiae: reapse tamen offendunt gravissime, non solum tantum ipsi opere, quantum ex mente qua ducuntur, et quia perutilem operam modernistarum ausibus conferunt.

Huic tantorum errorum agmini clam aperteque invadenti Leo XIII. decessor Noster fel. rec., praesertim in re biblica, occurrere fortiter dicto factuque conatus est. Sed modernistae, ut iam vidimus, non his facile terrentur armis: observantiam demissionemque animi affectantes summam, verba Pontificis Maximi in suas partes detorserunt, actus in alios quoslibet transtulere. Sic malum robustius in dies factum. Quamobrem, Venerabiles Fratres, moras diutius non interponere decretum est, atque efficaciora moliri.—Vos tamen oramus et obsecramus, ne in re tam gravi vigilantiam, diligentiam, fortitudinem vestram desiderari vel minimum patiamini. Quod vero a vobis petimus et expectamus, idipsum et petimus aequae et expectamus, a ceteris animarum pastoribus, ab educatoribus et magistris sacrae iuventutis, imprimis autem a summis religiosarum familiarum magistris.

I. Primo igitur ad studia quod attinet, volumus probeque mandamus ut philosophia scholastica studiorum sacrorum fundamentum ponatur.—Utique, "si quid a doctoribus scholasticis vel nimia subtilitate quaesitum, vel parum considerate traditum; si quid cum exploratis posterioris aevi doctrinis minus cohaerens vel denique quoquo modo non probabile; in nullo pacto in animo est aetati nostrae ad imitandum proponi."²⁴ Quod rei caput est, philosophiam scholasticam quum sequendam praescribimus, eam praecipue intelligimus, quae a sancto Thoma Aquinate est tradita; de qua quidquid a Decessore Nostro sanctum est, id omne vigere volumus, et qua sit opus instauramus et confirmamus, stricteque ab universis servari iubemus. Episcoporum erit, sicubi in Seminariis neglecta haec fuerint, ea ut in posterum custodiantur urgere atque exigere. Eadem religiosorum

²⁴ Leo XIII., Enc. "Aeterni Patris."

Ordinum moderatoribus praecepimus. Magistros autem monemus ut rite hoc teneant, Aequinatem deserere, praesertim in re metaphysica, non sine magno detrimento esse.

Hoc ita posito philosophiae fundamento, theologicum aedificium extruatur diligentissime.—Theologiae studium, Venerabiles Fratres, quanta potestis ope provehite, ut clerici e seminariis egredientes praeclara illius existimatione magnoque amore imbuantur, illudque semper pro deliciis habeant. Nam "In magna et multiplici disciplinarum copia quae menti veritatis cupidae obicitur, neminem latet sacram Theologiam ita principem sibi locum vindicare, ut vetus sapientium effatum sit, ceteris scientiis et artibus officium incumbere, ut ei inserviant ac velut ancillarum more famulentur."²⁵

—Addimus haec, eos etiam Nobis laude dignos videri, qui, incolumi reverentia erga Traditionem et Patres et ecclesiasticum magisterium, sapienti iudicio catholicisque usi normis (quod non aequè omnibus accidit) theologiam positivam, mutuato a veri nominis historia lumine, collustrare studeant. Maior profecto quam antehac positivae theologiae ratio est habenda; id tamen sic fiat, ut nihil scholastica detrimenti capiat, ilque reprehendantur, utpote qui modernistarum rem gerunt, quicumque positivam sic extollunt ut scholasticam theologiam despiciere videantur.

De profanis vero disciplinis satis sit revocare quae Decessor Noster sapientissime dixit:²⁶ "In rerum naturalium consideratione strenue adlaboretis: quo in genere nostrorum temporum ingeniosa inventa et utiliter ausa, sicut iure admirantur aequales, sic posterì perpetua commendatione et laude celebrabunt." Id tamen nullo sacrorum studiorum damno; quod idem Decessor Noster gravissimis hisce verbis prosequutus monuit:²⁷ "Quorum causam errorum, si quis diligentius investigaverit, in eo potissimum sitam esse intelligit, quod nostris hisce temporibus, quanto rerum naturalium studia vehementius fervent, tanto magis severiores altioresque disciplinae defloruerint: quaedam enim fere in oblivione hominum confite-scent; quaedam remisse leviterque tractantur, et quod indignum est, splendore pristinae dignitatis delecto, pravitate sententiarum et immanibus opinionum portentis inficiuntur." Ad hanc igitur legem naturalium disciplinarum studia in sacris seminariis temperari praecepimus.

II. His omnibus praeceptionibus tum Nostris tum Decessoris Nostri oculos adici oportet, quum de Seminariorum vel Universitatum catholicarum moderatoribus et magistris eligendis agendum erit.—Quicumque modo quopiam modernismo imbuti fuerint, ii, nullo habito rei cuiusvis respectu, tum a regundi tum a docendi munere arceantur; eo si iam funguntur, removeantur: item qui modernismo clam aperte favent, aut modernistas laudando eorumque culpam excusando, aut Scholasticam et Patres et Magisterium ecclesiasticum carpendo, aut ecclesiasticae potestati, in quocumque ea demum sit, obedientiam detrectando: item qui in historica re, vel archeologica, vel biblica nova student: item qui sacras negligunt disciplinas, aut profanas antepone-re videntur.—Hoc in negotio, Venerabiles Fratres, praesertim in magistrorum delectu, nimia nunquam erit animad-versio et constantia; ad doctorum enim exemplum plerumque componuntur discipuli. Quare, officii conscientia freti, prudenter hac in re at fortiter agitate.

Pari vigilantia et severitate ii sunt cognoscendi ac diligendi, qui sacris initiari postulent. Procul esto a sacro ordine novitatum amor: superbos et contumaces animos odit Deus!—Theologiae ac Iuris canonici laurea nullus in posterum donetur, qui statum curriculum in scholastica philosophia antea non elaboraverit. Quod si donetur, inaniter donatus esto.—Quae de celebrandis Universitatibus Sacrum Consilium Episcoporum et Religiosorum negotiis praepositum clericis Italiae tum saecularibus tum regularibus praecepit anno MDCCCXCVI.; ea ad nationes omnes posthac pertinere decernimus.—Clerici et sacerdotes qui catholicae cuiuspiam Universitati vel Instituto item catholico nomen dederint, disciplinas, de quibus magisteria in his fuerint, in civili Universitate ne ediscant. Sicubi id permissum, in posterum ut ne fiat edicimus.—Episcopi, qui huiusmodi Universitatibus vel Institutis moderandis praesunt, curent diligentissime ut quae hactenus imperavimus, ea constanter serventur.

III. Episcoporum pariter officium est modernistarum scripta quaeve modernismum olent provehuntque, si in lucem edita ne legantur cavere, si nondum edita prohibere ne edantur.—Item libri omnes, ephemerides, commentaria quaevis huius generis neve adolescentibus in Seminariis neve auditoribus in Universitatibus permittantur: non enim minus haec nocitura, quam quae contra mores conscripta; immo etiam magis, quod christianae vitae initia vitiant.—Nec secus iudicandum de quorundam catholicorum scriptionibus, hominum ceteroqui non malae mentis, sed qui theologiae disciplinae expertes ac recentiori philosophia imbuti, hanc cum fide com-

²⁵ Leo XIII., Litt. ap. "In magna," 10 dec. 1889.

²⁶ Alloc. 7 martii 1880.

²⁷ Loc. cit.

ponere nituntur et ad fidei, ut inquit, utilitates transferre. Hae, quia nullo metu versantur ob auctorum nomen bonamque existimationem, plus periculi afferunt ut sensim ad modernismum quis vergat.

Generatim vero, Venerabiles Fratres, ut in re tam gravi praecipiamus, quicumque in vestra uniuscuiusque dioecesi prostant libri ad legendum perniciosi, ii ut exulent, fortiter contendite, solemni etiam interdictione usi. Etsi enim Apostolica Sedes ad huiusmodi scripta et medio tollenda omnem operam impendat; adeo tamen iam numero crevere, ut vix notandis omnibus pares sint vires. Ex quo fit, ut serior quandoque paretur medicina, quum per longiores moras malum invaluit. Volumus igitur ut sacrorum Antistites, omni metu abiecto, prudentia carnis deposita, malorum clamoribus posthabitis, suaviter quidem sed constanter suas quisque partes suscipiant; memores quae Leo XIII. in Constitutione apostolica "Officiorum" praescribebat: "Ordinarii, etiam tamquam Delegati Sedis Apostolicae, libros aliaque scripta noxia in sua dioecesi edita vel diffusa proscribere et e manibus fidelium auferre studeant." Ius quidem his verbis tribuitur sed etiam officium mandatur. Nec quispiam hoc munus officii implevisse autumat, si unum alterumve librum ad Nos detulerit, dum alii bene multi dividi passim ac pervulgari sinuntur.—Nihil autem vos teneat, Venerabiles Fratres, quod forte libri alicuius auctor ea sit alibi facultate donatus, quam vulgo "Imprimatur" appellant: tum quia simulata esse possit, tum quia vel negligentius data vel benignitate nimia nimiaque fiducia de auctore concepta, quod postremum in Religiosorum forte ordinibus aliquando evenit. Accedit quod, sicut non idem omnibus convenit cibis, ita libri qui altero in loco sint adiaphori, nocentes in altero ob rerum complexum esse queunt. Si igitur Episcopus, audita prudentum sententia, horum etiam librorum aliquem in sua dioecesi notandum censuerit, potestatem ultro facimus immo et officium mandamus. Res utique decenter fiat, prohibitionem, si sufficiat, ad clerum unum coercendo; integro tamen bibliopolarum catholicorum officio libros ab Episcopo notatos minime venales habendi.—Et quoniam de his sermo incidit, vigilant Episcopi ne, lucri cupiditate, malam librarii mercerent mercem: certe in aliquorum indicibus modernistarum libri abunde nec parva cum laude proponuntur. Hos, si obedientiam detrectent, Episcopi, monitione praemissa, bibliopolarum catholicorum titulo privare ne dubitent; item potioreque iure si episcopales audiant: qui vero pontificio titulo ornantur, eos ad Sedem Apostolicam deferant.—Universis defumum in memoriam revocamus, quae memorata apostolica Constitutio "Officiorum" habet, articulo XXVI: "Omnes, qui facultatem apostolicam consecuti sunt legendi et retinendi libros prohibitos, nequeunt ideo legere et retinere libros quoslibet aut ephemerides ab Ordinariis locorum proscriptas, nisi eis in apostolico indulto expressa facta fuerit potestas legendi ac retinendi libros a quibuscumque damnatos."

IV. Nec tamen pravorum librorum satis est lectionem impedire ac venditionem; editionem etiam prohiberi oportet. Ideo edendi facultatem Episcopi severitate summa impertiant.—Quomam vero magno numero ea sunt ex Constitutione "Officiorum," quae Ordinarii permissionem ut edantur postulent, nec ipse per se Episcopus praecognoscere universa potest; in quibusdam dioecesebus ad cognitionem faciendam censores ex officio sufficienti numero destinantur. Huiusmodi censorum institutum laudamus quam maxime: illudque ut ad omnes dioeceses propagetur non hortamur modo sed omnino praescribimus. In universis igitur curiis episcopalibus censores ex officio adsint, qui edenda cognoscant; hi autem e gemino clero eligantur, aetate, eruditione, prudentia commendati, quique in doctrinis probandis improbandisque medio tutoque itinere eant. Ad illos scriptorum cognitio deferatur, quae ex articulis XLI, et XLII. memoratae Constitutionis venia ut edantur indigent. Censor sententiam scripto dabit. Ea si faverit. Episcopus potestatem edendi faciet per verbum "Imprimatur," cui tamen praeponetur formula "Nihil obstat," adscripto censoris nomine.—In Curia, romana, nec secus ac in ceteris omnibus, censores ex officio instituantur. Eos, audito prius Cardinali in Urbe Pontificis Vicario, tum vero annuente ac probante ipso Pontifice Maximo Magistro sacri Palatii apostolici designabit. Huius erit ad scripta singula cognoscenda censorem destinare. Editionis facultas ab eodem Magistro dabitur nec non a Cardinali Vicario Pontificis vel Antistite eius vices gerente, praemissa a censore, prout supra diximus, approbationis formula, adiectoque ipsius censoris nomine.—Extraordinariis tantum in adiunctis ac per quam raro, prudenti Episcopi arbitrio, censoris mentio intermitteri poterit.—Auctoribus censoris nomen patebit nunquam, antequam hic faventem sententiam ediderit; ne quid molestiae censori exhibeatur vel dum scripta cognoscit, vel si editionem non probavit.—Censores e religiosorum familiis nunquam eligantur, nisi prius moderatoris provinciae vel, si de Urbe agatur, moderatoris generalis secreto sententia audiat: is autem de eligendi moribus, scientia de doctrinae integritate pro officii conscientia testabitur.—Religiosorum moderatores de gravissimo officio monemus numquam sinendi aliquid a sulus subditis typis edi, nisi prius ipsorum et Ordinarii facultas intercesserit.—

Postremum edicimus et declaramus, censoris titulum, quo quis ornatur, nihil valere prorsus nec unquam posse afferri ad privatas eiusdem opiniones firmandas.

His universe dictis, nominatim servari diligentius praecipimus, quae articulo XLII. Constitutionis "Officiorum" in haec verba edicuntur: "Viri e clero seculari prohibentur quominus, absque praevia Ordinariolorum venia, diaria vel folia periodica moderanda suscipiant." Qua si qui venia perniciose utantur, ea, moniti primum, priventur.—Ad sacerdotes quod attinet, qui "correspondentium" vel "collaboratorum" nomine vulgo veniunt, quoniam frequentius evenit eos in ephemeridibus vel commentariis scripta edere modernismi labe infecta; videant Episcopi ne quid hi peccent, si peccarint moneant atque a scribendo prohibeant. Idipsum religiosorum moderatores ut praestent gravissime admonemus: qui si negligentius agant, Ordinarii auctoritate Pontificis Maximi provideant.—Ephemerides et commentaria, quae a catholicis scribuntur, quoad fieri possit, censorem designant habebant. Huius officium erit folia singula vel libellos, postquam sint edita, opportune perlegere: si quid dictum periculose fuerit, id quamprimum corrigendum iniungat. Eadem porro Episcopis facultas esto, etsi censor forte faverit.

V. Congressus publicosque coetus iam supra memoravimus, utpote in quibus suas modernistae opiniones tueri palam ac propagare student.—Sacerdotum conventus Episcopi in posterum haberi ne siverint, nisi rarissime. Quod si siverint, ea tantum lege sinent, ut nulla fiat rerum tractatio, quae ad Episcopos Sedemve Apostolicam pertinent; ut nihil proponatur vel postuletur, quod sacrae potestatis occupationem inferat; ut quidquid modernismus sapit, quidquid presbyterianismum vel laicismum, de eo penitus sermo conticescat.—Coetibus eiusmodi, quos singulatim, scripto, aptaque tempestate permitti oportet, nullus ex alia dioecesi sacerdos intersit, nisi litteris sui Episcopi commendatus.—Omnibus autem sacerdotibus animo ne excidant, quae Leo XIII. gravissime commendavit:²⁸ "Sancta sit apud sacerdotes Antistitum suorum auctoritas: pro certo habeant sacerdotale munus, nisi sub magisterio Episcoporum exerceatur, neque sanctum, nec satis utile, neque onestum futurum."

VI. Sed enim, Venerabiles Fratres, quid iuverit iussa a Nobis praeceptionesque dari, si non haec rite firmiterque servantur? Id ut feliciter pro votis cedat, visum est ad universas dioeceses proferre, quod Umbrorum Episcopi,²⁹ ante annos plures, pro suis prudentissime decreverunt. "Ad errores," sic illi, "iam diffusos expellendos atque ad impediendum quominus ulterius divulgentur, aut adhuc extent impietatis magistri per quos perniciosi perpetuentur effectus, qui ex illa divulgatione manarunt, sacer Conventus, sancti Caroli Borromaei vestigiis inhaerens, institui in unaquaque dioecesi decernit probatorum utriusque cleri consilium, cuius sit pervigilare an et quibus artibus novi errores serpent aut disseminentur, atque Episcopum de hisce docere, ut collatis consiliis remedia capiat, quibus id mali ipso suo initio extingui possit, ne ad animarum perniciem magis magisque diffundatur, vel quod pelus est in dies confirmetur et crescat."—Tale igitur Consilium, quod "a vigilantia" dici placet, in singulis dioecesium institui quamprimum decernimus. Viri, qui in illud adsciscantur, eo fere modo cooptabuntur, quo supra de censoribus statuimus. Altero quoque mense statoque die cum Episcopo convenient: quae tractarint decreverint, ea arcani lege custodiunt.—Officii munere haec sibi demandata habeant. Modernismi indicia ac vestigia tam in libris quam in magisteriis pervestigant vigilantiter; pro cleri iuventutaeque incolumitate, prudenter sed prompte et efficaciter praescribant.—Vocum novitatem caveant meminertintque Leonis XIII. monita.³⁰ "Probari non posse in catholicorum scriptis eam dicendi rationem quae, pravae novitatis studens pietatem fidelium ridere videatur loquaturque novum christianae vitae ordinem, novas Ecclesiae praeceptiones, nova moderni animi desideria, novam socialem cleri vocationem, novam christianam humanitatem, aliaque id genus multa." Haec in libris praelectionibusque ne patiantur.—Libros ne negligant, in quibus pia eiusque loci traditiones aut sacrae Reliquiae tractantur. Neu sinant eiusmodi questiones agitari in ephemeridibus vel in commentariis fovendae pietati destinatis, nec verbis ludibrium aut despectum sapientibus, nec stabilitus sententias, praesertim, ut fere accidit, si quae affirmantur probabilis fines non excedunt vel praeiudicatis nituntur opinionibus.

De sacris Reliquiis haec teneantur. Si Episcopi, qui uni in hac re possunt, certo norint Reliquiam esse subditiariam, fidelium cultu removeant. Si Reliquiae cuiuspiam auctoritates, ob civiles forte perturbaciones vel alio quovis casu, interierint; ne publice ea proponatur nisi rite ab Episcopo recognita. Praescriptionis argumentum vel fundatae praesumptionis tunc

²⁸ Litt. Enc. "Noblissima Gallorum," 10 febr. 1884.

²⁹ Act. Consess. Epp. Umbriae, Novembri 1849, Tit. II., art. 6.

³⁰ Instruct. S. C. NN. EE. EE. 27 ian. 1902.

tantum valebit, si cultus antiquitate commendetur; nimirum pro decreto anno MDCCCXCVI. a sacro Consilio indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis cognoscendis edito, quo edicitur: "Reliquias antiquas conservandas esse in ea veneratione in qua hactenus fuerunt, nisi iu casu particulari certa adsint argumenta eas falsas vel sopposititias esse."—Quum autem de piis traditionibus iudicium fuerit, illud ineminisse oportet: Ecclesiam tanta in hac re uti prudentia, ut traditiones eiusmodi ne scripto narrari permittat nisi cautione multa adhibita praemissaque declaratione ab Urbano VIII. sancita; quod etsi rite fiat, non tamen facti veritatem adserit; sed, nisi humana ad credendum argumenta desint, credi modo non prohibet. Sic plane sacrum Consilium legitimis ritibus tuendis, abhinc annis XXX., edicebat;³¹ "Eiusmodi apparitiones seu revelationes neque approbatas neque damnatas ab Apostolica Sede fuisse, sed tantum permissas tamquam pie credendas fide solum humana, iuxta traditionem quam ferunt, idoneis etiam testimoniis ac monumentis confirmatam." Hoc qui teneat, metu omni vacabit. Nam Apparitionis cuiusvis religio, prout factum ipsum spectat et "relativa" dicitur, conditionem semper habet implicitam de veritate facti: prout vero "absoluta" est, semper in veritate nititur, fertur enim in personas ipsas Sanctorum qui honorantur. Similiter de Reliquiis affirmandum.—Illud demum Consilio "vigilantiae" demandamus, ut ad socialia instituta itemque ad scripta quaevis de re sociali assidue ac diligenter adiciant oculos, ne quid in illis modernismi lateat, sed Romanorum Pontificum praeceptionibus respondeant.

VII. Haec quae praecepimus ne forte oblivioni dentur, volumus et mandamus ut singularum dioecesium Episcopi, anno exacto ab editione praesentium literarum, postea vero tertio quoque anno, diligenti ac iurata enarratione referant ad Sedem Apostolicam de his quae hac Nostra Epistola decernuntur, itemque de doctrinis quae in clero vigent, praesertim autem in Seminariis ceterisque catholicis Institutis, iis non exceptis quae Ordinarii auctoritati non subsunt. Idipsum Moderatoribus generalibus ordinum religiosorum pro suis alumniis iniungimus.

Haec vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, scribenda duximus ad salutem omni credenti. Adversarii vero Ecclesiae his certe abutentur ut veterem calumniam refricent, qua sapientiae atque humanitatis progressioni infesti traducimur. His accusationibus, quas christianae religionis historia perpetuis argumentis refellit, ut novi aliquid opponamus, mens est peculiare Institutum omni ope provehere, in quo, invariantibus quotquot sunt inter catholicos sapientiae fama insignes, quidquid est scientiarum, quidquid omne genus eruditionis, catholica veritate duce et magistra, promoveatur. Faxit Deus ut proposita feliciter impleamus, suppetitis ferentibus quicumque Ecclesiam Christi sincero amore amplectuntur. Sed de his alias.—Interea vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, de quorum opera et studio vehementer confidimus, superni luminis copiam toto animo exoramus ut, in tanto animorum discrimine ex gliscentibus undequaque erroribus, quae vobis agenda sint videatis, et ad implenda quae videritis omni vi ac fortitudine incumbatis. Adsit vobis virtute sua Iesus Christus, auctor et consummator fidei nostrae; adsit prece atque auxilio Virgo immaculata, cunctarum haeresum interemprix.—Nos vero, pignus caritatis Nostrae divinique in adversis solatii, Apostolicam Benedictionem vobis, cleris populisque vestris amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die VIII. Septembris MCMVII., Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto.

PIVS PP. X.

³¹ Decr. 2 maii 1877.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE MODERNISTS.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER
LOCAL ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE
APOSTOLIC SEE.

PIUS X. POPE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

THE office divinely committed to us of feeding the Lord's flock has especially this duty assigned to it by Christ, namely, to guard with the greatest vigilance the deposit of the faith delivered to the saints, rejecting the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called. There has never been a time when this watchfulness of the supreme pastor was not necessary to the Catholic body; for, owing to the efforts of the enemy of the human race, there have never been lacking "men speaking perverse things" (Acts xx., 30), "vain talkers and seducers" (Tit. i., 10), "erring and driving into error" (II. Tim. iii., 13). Still, it must be confessed that the number of the enemies of the cross of Christ has in these last days increased exceedingly, who are striving, by arts entirely new and full of subtlety, to destroy the vital energy of the Church, and, if they can, to overthrow utterly Christ's kingdom itself. Wherefore we may no longer be silent, lest we should seem to fail in our most sacred duty, and lest the kindness that, in the hope of wiser counsels, we have hitherto shown them should be attributed to forgetfulness of our office.

GRAVITY OF THE SITUATION.

That we may make no delay in this matter is rendered necessary especially by the fact that the partisans of error are to be sought not only among the Church's open enemies; they lie hid, a thing to be deeply deplored and feared, in her very bosom and heart, and are the more mischievous the less conspicuously they appear. We allude, venerable brethren, to many who belong to the Catholic laity, nay, and this is far more lamentable, to the ranks of the priesthood itself, who, feigning a love for the Church, lacking the firm protection of philosophy and theology, nay, more, thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the church, and lost to all sense of modesty, vaunt themselves as reformers the Church, and lost to all sense of modesty, vaunt themselves as reformers is most sacred in the work of Christ, not sparing even the person of the Divine Redeemer, whom, with sacrilegious daring, they reduce to a simple, mere man.

Though they express astonishment themselves, no one can justly be surprised that we number such men among the enemies of the Church, if, leaving out of consideration the internal disposition of soul, of which God alone is the judge, he is acquainted with their tenets, their manner of speech, their conduct. Nor, indeed, will He err in accounting them the most pernicious of all the adversaries of the Church. For, as we have said, they put their designs for her ruin into operation not from without, but from within; hence the danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose injury is the more certain, the more intimate is their knowledge of her. Moreover, they lay the axe not to the branches and shoots, but to the very root; that is, to the faith and its deepest fibres. And having struck at this root of immortality, they proceed to disseminate poison through the whole tree, so that there is no part of Catholic truth from which they hold their hand, none that they do not strive to corrupt. Further, none is more skillful, none more astute than they in the employment of a thousand noxious arts; for they double the parts of rationalist and Catholic, and this so craftily that they easily lead the unwary into error; and since audacity is their chief characteristic, there is no conclusion of any kind from which they shrink or which they do not thrust forward with pertinacity and assurance. To this must be added the fact, which indeed is well calculated to deceive souls, that they lead a life of the greatest activity of assiduous and ardent application to every branch of learning, and that they possess, as a rule, a reputation for the strictest morality. Finally, and this almost destroys all hope of cure, their very doctrines have given such a bent to their minds that they disdain all

authority and brook no restraint; and, relying upon a false conscience, they attempt to ascribe to a love of truth that which is in reality the result of pride and obstinacy.

Once, indeed, we had hopes of recalling them to a better sense, and to this end we first of all showed them kindness as our children, then we treated them with severity, and at last we have had recourse, though with great reluctance, to public reproof. But you know, venerable brethren, how fruitless has been our action. They bowed their head for a moment, but it was soon uplifted more arrogantly than ever. If it were a matter which concerned them alone, we might perhaps have overlooked it; but the security of the Catholic name is at stake. Wherefore, as to maintain it longer would be a crime, we must now break silence, in order to expose before the whole Church in their true colors those men who have assumed this bad disguise.

DIVISION OF THE ENCYCLICAL.

But since the modernists (as they are commonly and rightly called) employ a very clever artifice, namely, to present their doctrines without order and systematic arrangement into one whole, scattered and disjointed one from another, so as to appear to be in doubt and uncertainty, while they are in reality firm and steadfast, it will be of advantage, venerable brethren, to bring their teachings together here into one group, and to point out the connection between them, and thus to pass to an examination of the sources of the errors and to prescribe remedies for averting the evil.

PART I.

ANALYSIS OF MODERNIST TEACHING.

To proceed in an orderly manner in this recondite subject, it must first of all be noted that every modernist sustains and comprises within himself many personalities; he is a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, an historian, a critic, an apologist, a reformer. These roles must be clearly distinguished from one another by all who would accurately know their system and thoroughly comprehend the principles and the consequences of their doctrines.

AGNOSTICISM ITS PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION.

We begin, then, with the philosopher. Modernists place the foundation of religious philosophy in that doctrine which is usually called agnosticism. According to this teaching, human reason is confined entirely within the field of phenomena; that is to say, to things that are perceptible to the senses, and in the manner in which they are perceptible. It has no right and no power to transgress these limits. Hence it is incapable of lifting itself up to God and of recognizing His existence, even by means of visible things. From this it is inferred that God can never be the direct object of science, and that, as regards history, He must not be considered as an historical subject. Given these premises, all will readily perceive what becomes of natural theology, of the motives of credibility, of external revelation. The modernists simply make away with them altogether; they include them in intellectualism, which they call a ridiculous and long ago defunct system. Nor does the fact that the Church has formally condemned these portentous errors exercise the slightest restraint upon them. Yet the Vatican Council has defined: "If any one says that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason by means of the things that are made, let him be anathema" (De Revel., can. 1); and also: "If any one says that it is not possible or not expedient that man be taught, through the medium of divine revelation, about God and the worship to be paid Him, let him be anathema" (*Ibid.*, can. 2); and, finally: "If any one says that divine revelation cannot be made credible by external signs, and that therefore men should be drawn to the faith only by their personal internal experience or by private inspiration, let him be anathema" (De Fide, can. 3). But how the modernists make the transition from agnosticism, which is a state of pure nescience, to scientific and historic atheism, which is a doctrine of positive denial; and, consequently, by what legitimate process of reasoning, starting from ignorance as to whether God has in fact intervened in the history of the human race or not, they proceed, in their explanation of this history, to ignore God altogether, as if He really had not intervened, let him answer who can. Yet it is a fixed and established principle among them that both science and history must be atheistic: and within their boundaries there is room for nothing but phenomena; God and all that is

divine are utterly excluded. We shall soon see clearly what, according to this most absurd teaching, must be held touching the most sacred person of Christ, what concerning the mysteries of His life and death, and of His resurrection and ascension into heaven.

VITAL IMMANENCE.

However, this agnosticism is only the negative part of the system of the modernist: the positive side of it consists in what they call vital immanence. This is how they advance from one to the other. Religion, whether natural or supernatural, must, like every other fact, admit of some explanation. But when natural theology has been destroyed, the road to revelation closed through the rejection of the arguments of credibility, and all external revelation absolutely denied, it is clear that this explanation will be sought in vain outside man himself. It must, therefore, be looked for in man; and since religion is a form of life, the explanation must certainly be found in the life of man. Hence the principle of religious immanence is formulated. Moreover, the first actuation, so to say, of every vital phenomenon, and religion, as has been said, belongs to this category, is due to a certain necessity or impulsion; but it has its origin, speaking more particularly of life, in a movement of the heart, which movement is called a sentiment. Therefore, since God is the object of religion, we must conclude that faith, which is the basis and the foundation of all religion, consists in a sentiment which originates from a need of the divine. This need of the divine, which is experienced only in special and favorable circumstances, cannot of itself appertain to the domain of consciousness; it is at first latent within the consciousness, or, to borrow a term from modern philosophy, in the sub-consciousness, where also its roots lie hidden and undetected.

Should any one ask how it is that this need of the divine which man experiences within himself grows up into a religion, the modernists reply thus: Science and history, they say, are confined within two limits, the one external, namely, the visible world, the other internal, which is consciousness. When one or other of these boundaries has been reached, there can be no further progress, for beyond is the unknowable. In presence of this unknowable, whether it is outside man and beyond the visible world of nature or lies hidden within the subconsciousness, the need of the divine, according to the principles of fideism, excites in a soul with a propensity towards religion a certain special sentiment, without any previous advertence of the mind: and this sentiment possesses, implied within itself both as its own object and as its intrinsic cause, the reality of the divine, and in a way unites man with God. It is this sentiment to which modernists give the name of faith, and this it is which they consider the beginning of religion.

But we have not yet come to the end of their philosophy, or, to speak more accurately, their folly. For modernism finds in this sentiment not faith only, but with and in faith, as they understand it, revelation, they say, abides. For what more can one require for revelation? Is not that religious sentiment which is perceptible in the consciousness revelation, or at least the beginning of revelation? Nay, is not God Himself, as He manifests Himself to the soul, indistinctly it is true, in this same religious sense, revelation? And they add: Since God is both the object and the cause of faith, this revelation is at the same time of God and from God; that is, God is both the revealer and the revealed.

Hence, venerable brethren, springs that ridiculous proposition of the modernists, that every religion, according to the different aspect under which it is viewed, must be considered as both natural and supernatural. Hence it is that they make consciousness and revelation synonymous. Hence the law, according to which religious consciousness is given as the universal rule, to be put on an equal footing with revelation, and to which all must submit, even the supreme authority of the Church, whether in its teaching capacity or in that of legislator in the province of sacred liturgy or discipline.

DEFORMATION OF RELIGIOUS HISTORY THE CONSEQUENCE.

However, in all this process, from which, according to the modernists, faith and revelation spring, one point is to be particularly noted, for it is of capital importance on account of the historico-critical corollaries which are deduced from it.—For the unknowable they talk of does not present itself to faith as something solitary and isolated, but rather in close conjunction with some phenomenon, which, though it belongs to the realm of science and history, yet to some extent oversteps their bounds. Such a phenomenon may be a fact of nature containing within itself something mysterious; or it may be a man, whose character, actions and words can-

not, apparently, be reconciled with the ordinary laws of history. Then faith, attracted by the unknowable, which is united with the phenomenon, possesses itself of the whole phenomenon, and, as it were, permeates it with its own life. From this two things follow. The first is a sort of transfiguration of the phenomenon, by its elevation above its own true conditions, by which it becomes more adapted to that form of the divine which faith will infuse into it. The second is a kind of disfigurement, which springs from the fact that faith, which has made the phenomenon independent of the circumstances of place and time, attributes to it qualities which it has not; and this is true particularly of the phenomena of the past, and the older they are, the truer it is. From these two principles the modernists deduce two laws, which, when united with a third which they have already got from agnosticism, constitute the foundation of historical criticism. We will take an illustration from the person of Christ. In the person of Christ, they say, science and history encounter nothing that is not human. Therefore, in virtue of the first canon deduced from agnosticism, whatever there is in His history suggestive of the divine must be rejected. Then, according to the second canon, the historical person of Christ was transfigured by faith; therefore, everything that raises it above historical conditions must be removed. Lastly, the third canon, which lays down that the person of Christ has been disfigured by faith, requires that everything should be excluded, deeds and words and all else that is not in keeping with His character, circumstances and education, and with the place and time in which He lived. A strange style of reasoning, truly; but it is modernist criticism.

Therefore, the religious sentiment, which through the agency of vital immanence emerges from the lurking-places of the subconsciousness, is the germ of all religion, and the explanation of everything that has been or ever will be in any religion. This sentiment, which was at first only rudimentary and almost formless, gradually matured, under the influence of that mysterious principle from which it originated, with the progress of human life, of which, as has been said, it is a form. This, then, is the origin of all religion, even supernatural religion; it is only a development of this religious sentiment. Nor is the Catholic religion an exception; it is quite on a level with the rest, for it was engendered, by the process of vital immanence, in the consciousness of Christ, who was a man of the choicest nature, whose like has never been, nor will be.—Those who hear these audacious, these sacrilegious assertions are simply shocked. And yet, venerable brethren, these are not merely the foolish babblings of infidels. There are many Catholics, yea, and priests, too, who say these things openly; and they boast that they are going to reform the Church by these ravings! There is no question now of the old error, by which a sort of right to the supernatural order was claimed for the human nature. We have gone far beyond that: we have reached the point when it is affirmed that our most holy religion, in the man Christ as in us, emanated from nature spontaneously and entirely. Than this there is surely nothing more destructive of the whole supernatural order. Wherefore the Vatican Council most justly decreed: "If any one says that man cannot be raised by God to a knowledge and perfection which surpasses nature, but that he can and should, by his own efforts and by a constant development, attain finally to the possession of all truth and good, let him be anathema" (De Revel., can. 3).

THE ORIGIN OF DOGMAS.

So far, venerable brethren, there has been no mention of the intellect. Still it also, according to the teaching of the modernists, has its part in the act of faith. And it is of importance to see how.—In the sentiment of which we have frequently spoken, since sentiment is not knowledge, God indeed presents Himself to man, but in a manner so confused and indistinct that He can hardly be perceived by the believer. It is therefore necessary that a ray of light should be cast upon this sentiment, so that God may be clearly distinguished and set apart from it. This is the task of the intellect, whose office it is to reflect and to analyze, and by means of which man first transforms into mental pictures the vital phenomena which arise within him, and then expresses them in words. Hence the common saying of modernists: that the religious man must ponder his faith.—The intellect, then, encountering this sentiment, directs itself upon it, and produces in it a work resembling that of a painter who restores and gives new life to a picture that has perished with age. The simile is that of one of the leaders of modernism. The operation of the intellect in this work is a double one: First, by a natural and spontaneous act it expresses its concept in a simple, ordinary statement; then, on reflection and deeper consideration, or, as they say, by elaborating its thought, it expresses the idea in secondary propositions, which are derived from the first, but are more perfect and distinct.

These secondary propositions, if they finally receive the approval of the supreme magisterium of the Church, constitute dogma.

Thus we have reached one of the principal points in the modernists' system, namely, the origin and the nature of dogma. For they place the origin of dogma in those primitive and simple formulas, which, under a certain aspect, are necessary to faith; for revelation, to be truly such, requires the clear manifestation of God in the consciousness. But dogma itself, they apparently hold, is contained in the secondary formulas.

To ascertain the nature of dogma we must first find the relation which exists between the religious formulas and the religious sentiment. This will be readily perceived by him who realizes that these formulas have no other purpose, than to furnish the believer with a means of giving an account of his faith to himself. These formulas therefore stand midway between the believer and his faith; in their relation to the faith they are the inadequate expression of its object, and are usually called symbols; in their relation to the believer they are mere instruments.

ITS EVOLUTION.

Hence it is quite impossible to maintain that they express absolute truth, for, in so far as they are symbols, they are the images of truth, and so must be adapted to the religious sentiment in its relation to man; and as instruments they are the vehicles of truth, and must therefore in their turn be adapted to man in his relation to the religious sentiment. But the object of the religious sentiment, since it embraces the absolute, possesses an infinite variety of aspects, of which now one, now another, may present itself. In like manner, he who believes may pass through different phases. Consequently the formulas, too, which we call dogmas, must be subject to these vicissitudes, and are therefore liable to change. Thus the way is open to the intrinsic evolution of dogma. An immense collection of sophisms this, that ruins and destroys all religion. Dogma is not only able, but ought to evolve and to be changed. This is strongly affirmed by the modernists, and as clearly flows from their principles. For amongst the chief points of their teaching is this which they deduce from the principle of vital immanence: that religious formulas, to be really religious and not merely theological speculations, ought to be living and to live the life of the religious sentiment. This is not to be understood in the sense that these formulas, especially if merely imaginative, were to be made for the religious sentiment; it has no more to do with their origin than with number or quality; what is necessary is that the religious sentiment, when needful, introduced some modification, should vitally assimilate them. In other words, it is necessary that the primitive formula be accepted and sanctioned by the heart; and, similarly, the subsequent work from which spring the secondary formulas must proceed under the guidance of the heart. Hence it comes that these formulas, to be living, should be, and should remain, adapted to the faith and to him who believes. Wherefore, if for any reason this adaptation should cease to exist, they lose their first meaning, and accordingly must be changed. And since the character and lot of dogmatic formulas is so precarious, there is not room for surprise that modernists regard them so lightly and in such open disrespect. And so they audaciously charge the Church both with taking the wrong road from inability to distinguish the religious and moral sense of formulas from their surface meaning and with clinging tenaciously and vainly to meaningless formulas whilst religion is allowed to go to ruin. Blind that they are, and leaders of the blind, inflated with a boastful science, they have reached that pitch of folly where they pervert the eternal concept of truth and the true nature of the religious sentiment; with that new system of theirs they are seen to be under the sway of a blind and unchecked passion for novelty, thinking not at all of finding some solid foundation of truth, but despising the holy and apostolic traditions, they embrace other vain, futile, uncertain doctrines condemned by the Church, on which, in the height of their vanity, they think they can rest and maintain truth itself. (Gregory XVI., *Encycl. "Singulari Nos,"* 7 Kal., Jul., 1834.)

THE MODERNIST AS BELIEVER: INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE AND RELIGIOUS CERTITUDE.

Thus far, venerable brethren, of the modernist considered as philosopher. Now if we proceed to consider him as believer, seeking to know how the believer, according to modernism, is differentiated from the philosopher, it must be observed that although the philosopher recognizes as the object of faith the divine reality, still this reality is not to be found but in the heart of the believer, as being an object of sentiment and affirmation; and therefore confined within the sphere of phenomena. But as to whether it exists

outside that sentiment and affirmation is a matter which in no way concerns the philosopher. For the modernist believer, on the contrary, it is an established and certain fact that the divine reality does really exist in itself and quite independently of the person who believes in it. If you ask on what foundation this assertion of the believer rests, they answer: In the experience of the individual. On this head the modernists differ from the rationalists only to fall into the opinion of the Protestants and pseudo-mystics. This is their manner of putting the question: In the religious sentiment one must recognize a kind of intuition of the heart which puts man in immediate contact with the very reality of God, and infuses such a persuasion of God's existence and His action both within and without man as to excel greatly any scientific conviction. They assert, therefore, the existence of a real experience, and one of a kind that surpasses all rational experience. If this experience is denied by some, like the rationalists, it arises from the fact that such persons are unwilling to put themselves in the moral state which is necessary to produce it. It is this experience which, when a person acquires it, makes him properly and truly a believer.

How far off we are here from Catholic teaching we have already seen in the decree of the Vatican Council. We shall see later how, with such theories, added to the other errors already mentioned, the way is opened wide for atheism. Here it is well to note at once that, given this doctrine of experience, united with the other doctrine of symbolism, every religion, even that of paganism, must be held to be true. What is to prevent such experiences from being met with in every religion? In fact, that they are to be found is asserted by not a few. And with what right will modernists deny the truth of an experience affirmed by a follower of Islam? With what right can they claim true experiences for Catholics alone? Indeed, modernists do not deny, but actually admit, some confusedly, others in the most open manner, that all religions are true. That they cannot feel otherwise is clear. For on what ground, according to their theories, could falsity be predicated of any religion whatsoever? It must be certainly on one of these two: either on account of the falsity of the religious sentiment or on account of the falsity of the formula pronounced by the mind. Now, the religious sentiment, although it may be more perfect or is less perfect, is always one and the same; and the intellectual formula, in order to be true, has but to respond to the religious sentiment and to the believer, whatever be the intellectual capacity of the latter. In the conflict between different religions, the most that modernists can maintain is that the Catholic has more truth because it is more living, and that it deserves with more reason the name of Christian because it corresponds more fully with the origins of Christianity. That these consequences flow from the premises will not seem unnatural to anybody. But what is amazing is that there are Catholics and priests who, we would fain believe, abhor such enormities, yet act as if they fully approved of them. For they heap such praise and bestow such public honor on the teachers of these errors as to give rise to the belief that their admiration is not meant merely for the persons, who are perhaps not devoid of a certain merit, but rather for the errors which these persons openly profess, and which they do all in their power to propagate.

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE AND TRADITION.

But this doctrine of experience is also under another aspect entirely contrary to Catholic truth. It is extended and applied to tradition, as hitherto understood by the Church, and destroys it. By the modernists tradition is understood as a communication to others, through preaching, by means of the intellectual formula, of an original experience. To this formula, in addition to its representative value, they attribute a species of suggestive efficacy which acts both in the person who believes to stimulate the religious sentiment should it happen to have grown sluggish and to renew the experience once acquired, and in those who do not yet believe to awake for the first time the religious sentiment in them and to produce the experience. In this way is religious experience propagated among the peoples; and not merely among contemporaries by preaching, but among future generations both by books and by oral transmission from one to another. Sometimes this communication of religious experience takes root and thrives, at other times it withers at once and dies. For the modernists to live is a proof of truth, since for them life and truth are one and the same thing. Hence again it is given to us to infer that all existing religions are equally true, for otherwise they would not live.

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

Having reached this point, venerable brethren, we have sufficient material in hand to enable us to see the relations which modernists establish between

faith and science, including history and also under the name of science. And in the first place it is to be held that the object of the one is quite extraneous to and separate from the object of the other. For faith occupies itself solely with something which science declares to be unknowable for it. Hence each has a separate field assigned to it: science is entirely concerned with the reality of phenomena, into which faith does not enter at all; faith, on the contrary, concerns itself with the divine reality, which is entirely unknown to science. Thus the conclusion is reached that there can never be any dissension between faith and science, for if each keeps on its own ground they can never meet, and therefore never be in contradiction. And if it be objected that in the visible world there are some things which appertain to faith, such as the human life of Christ, the modernists reply by denying this. For though such things come within the category of phenomena, still in as far as they are lived by faith and in the way already described have been by faith transfigured, and disfigured, they have been removed from the world of sense and translated to become material for the divine. Hence should it be further asked whether Christ has wrought real miracles, and made real prophecies, whether He rose truly from the dead and ascended into heaven, the answer of agnostic science will be in the negative and the answer of faith in the affirmative—yet there will not be on that account any conflict between them. For it will be denied by the philosopher as philosopher, speaking to philosophers and considering Christ only in His historical reality; and it will be affirmed by the believer, speaking to believers and considering the life of Christ as lived again by the faith and in the faith.

FAITH SUBJECT TO SCIENCE.

Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that, given these theories, one is authorized to believe that faith and science are dependent of one another. On the side of science the independence is indeed complete, but it is quite different with regard to faith, which is subject to science not on one, but on three grounds. For in the first place it must be observed that in every religious fact, when you take away the divine reality and the experience of it which the believer possesses, everything else, and especially the religious formulas of it, belongs to the sphere of phenomena, and therefore falls under the control of science. Let the believer leave the world if he will, but so long as he remains in it he must continue, whether he like it or not, to be subject to the laws, the observation, the judgments of science and of history. Further, when it is said that God is the object of faith alone, the statement refers only to the divine reality, not to the idea of God. The latter also is subject to science, which while it philosophizes in what is called the logical order, soars also to the absolute and the ideal. It is therefore the right of philosophy and of science to form conclusions concerning the idea of God, to direct it in its evolution and to purify it of any extraneous elements which may become confused with it. Finally, man does not suffer a dualism to exist in him, and the believer therefore feels within him an impelling need so to harmonize faith with science that it may never oppose the general conception which science sets forth concerning the universe.

Thus it is evident that science is to be entirely independent of faith, while, on the other hand, and notwithstanding that they are supposed to be strangers to each other, faith is made subject to science. All this, venerable brothers, is in formal opposition with the teachings of our predecessor, Pius IX., where he lays it down that: In matters of religion it is the duty of philosophy not to command, but to serve; not to prescribe what is to be believed, but to embrace what is to be believed with reasonable obedience; not to scrutinize the depths of the mysteries of God, but to venerate them devoutly and humbly. (Brev. ad Ep. Wratlslaw, 15 Jun., 1857.)

The modernists completely invert the parts, and to them may be applied the words of another predecessor of ours, Gregory IX., addressed to some theologians of his time: "Some among you, inflated like bladders with the spirit of vanity, strive by profane novelties to cross the boundaries fixed by the fathers, twisting the sense of the heavenly pages . . . to the philosophical teaching of the rationals, not for the profit of their hearers, but to make a show of science . . . these, seduced by strange and eccentric doctrines, make the head of the tail and force the queen to serve the servant." (Ep. ad Magistros theol. Paris non, Jul., 1224.)

THE METHODS OF MODERNISTS.

This becomes still clearer to anybody who studies the conduct of modernists, which is in perfect harmony with their teachings. In their writings and addresses they seem not unfrequently to advocate now one doctrine,

now another, so that one would be disposed to regard them as vague and doubtful. But there is a reason for this, and it is to be found in their ideas as to the mutual separation of science and faith. Hence in their books you find some things which might well be expressed by a Catholic, but in the next page you find other things which might have been dictated by a rationalist. When they write history, they make no mention of the divinity of Christ, but when they are in the pulpit they profess it clearly. Again, when they write history they pay no heed to the fathers and the councils, but when they catechize the people, they cite them respectfully. In the same way they draw their distinctions between theological and pastoral exegesis and scientific and historical exegesis. So, too, acting on the principle that science in no way depends upon faith, when they treat of philosophy, history, criticism, feeling no horror at treading in the footsteps of Luther," (Prop. 29 damn. a Leone X. Bull. "Exsurge Domine," 16 maii 1520. "Via nobis facta est enervandi auctoritatem Conciliorum, et libere contradicendi eorum gestis, et iudicanti eorum decreta, et confidenter confietendi quicquid verum videtur, sive probatum fuerit, sive reprobatum a quocumque Concilio.") They are wont to display a certain contempt for Catholic doctrines, for the Holy Fathers, for the Ecumenical Councils, for the ecclesiastical magisterium; and should they be rebuked for this, they complain that they are being deprived of their liberty. Lastly, guided by the theory that faith must be subject to science, they continuously and openly criticize the Church because of her sheer obstinacy in refusing to submit and accommodate her dogmas to the opinions of philosophy; while they, on their side, after having blotted out the old theology, endeavor to introduce a new theology which shall follow the vagaries of their philosophers.

THE MODERNIST AS THEOLOGIAN: HIS PRINCIPLES, IMMANENCE AND SYMBOLISM.

And thus, venerable brethren, the road is open for us to study the modernists in the theological arena—a difficult task, yet one that may be disposed of briefly. The end to be attained is the conciliation of faith with science, always, however, saving the primacy of science over faith. In this branch the modernist theologian avails himself of exactly the same principles which we have seen employed by the modernist philosopher, and applies them to the believer: the principles of immanence and symbolism. The process is an extremely simple one. The philosopher has declared: The principle of faith is immanent; the believer has added: This principle is God; and the theologian draws the conclusion: God is immanent in man. Thus we have theological immanence. So, too, the philosopher regards as certain that the representations of the object of faith are merely symbolical; the believer has affirmed that the object of faith is God in Himself; and the theologian proceeds to affirm that the representations of the divine reality are symbolical. And thus we have theological symbolism. Truly enormous errors both, the pernicious character of which will be seen clearly from an examination of their consequences. For, to begin with symbolism, since symbols are but symbols in regard to their objects, and only instruments in regard to the believer, it is necessary, first of all, according to the teachings of the modernists, that the believer do not lay too much stress on the formula, but avail himself of it only with the scope of uniting himself to the absolute truth which the formula at once reveals and conceals; that is to say, endeavors to express, but without succeeding in doing so. They would also have the believer avail himself of the formulas only in as far as they are useful to him, for they are given to be a help and not a hindrance; with proper regard, however, for the social respect due to formulas which the public magisterium has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magisterium provide otherwise. Concerning immanence, it is not easy to determine what modernists mean by it, for their own opinions on the subject vary. Some understand it in the sense that God working in man is more intimately present in him than man is in even himself, and this conception, if properly understood, is free from reproach. Others hold that the divine action is one with the action of nature, as the action of the first cause is one with the action of the secondary cause, and this would destroy the supernatural order. Others, finally, explain it in a way which savors of pantheism, and this, in truth, is the sense which tallies best with the rest of their doctrines.

With this principle of immanence is connected another, which may be called the principle of divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way as the private experience differs from the experience transmitted by tradition. An example will illustrate what is meant, and this example is offered by the Church and the sacraments. The Church and the sacraments, they say, are not to be regarded as having been instituted by

Christ Himself. This is forbidden by agnosticism, which sees in Christ nothing more than a man whose religious consciousness has been like that of all men, formed by degrees; it is also forbidden by the law of immanence, which rejects what they call external application; it is further forbidden by the law of evolution, which requires for the development of the germs a certain time and a certain series of circumstances; it is, finally, forbidden by history, which shows that such, in fact, has been the course of things. Still, it is to be held that both Church and sacraments have been founded mediately by Christ. But how? In this way: All Christian consciences were, they affirm, in a manner virtually included in the conscience of Christ as the plant is included in the seed. But as the shoots live the life of the seed, so, too, all Christians are to be said to live the life of Christ. But the life of Christ is according to faith, and so, too, is the life of Christians. And since this life produced, in the course of ages, both the Church and the sacraments, it is quite right to say that their origin is from Christ and is divine. In the same way they prove that the Scriptures and the dogmas are divine. And thus the modernistic theology may be said to be complete. No great thing, in truth, but more than enough for the theologian who professes that the conclusions of science must always, and in all things, be respected. The application of these theories to the other points we shall proceed to expound anybody may easily make for himself.

DOGMA AND THE SACRAMENTS.

Thus far we have spoken of the origin and nature of faith. But as faith has many shoots, and chief among them the Church, dogma, worship, the books which we call "sacred," of these also we must know what is taught by the modernists. To begin with dogma, we have already indicated its origin and nature. Dogma is born of the species of impulse or necessity, by virtue of which the believer is constrained to elaborate his religious thought so as to render it clearer for himself and others. This elaboration consists entirely in the process of penetrating and refining the primitive formula, not indeed in itself and according to logical development, but as required by circumstances, or vitally, as the modernists more abstrusely put it. Hence it happens that around the primitive formula secondary formulas gradually continue to be formed, and these subsequently grouped into bodies of doctrine, or into doctrinal constructions, as they prefer to call them, and further sanctioned by the public magisterium as responding to the common consciousness, are called dogma. Dogma is to be carefully distinguished from the speculations of theologians, which, although not alive with the life of dogma, are not without their utility as serving to harmonize religion with science and remove opposition between the two in such a way as to throw light from without on religion, and it may be even to prepare the matter for future dogma. Concerning worship there would not be much to be said were it not that under this head are comprised the sacraments, concerning which the modernists fall into the gravest errors. For them the sacraments are the resultant of a double need—for, as we have seen, everything in their system is explained by inner impulses or necessities. In the present case the first need is that of giving some sensible manifestation to religion; the second is that of propagating it, which could not be done without some sensible form and consecrating acts, and these are called sacraments. But for the modernists the sacraments are mere symbols or signs, though not devoid of a certain efficacy—an efficacy, they tell us, like that of certain phrases vulgarly described as having "caught on," inasmuch as they have become the vehicle for the diffusion of certain great ideas which strike the public mind. What the phrases are to the ideas, that the sacraments are to the religious sentiment—that and nothing more. The modernists would be speaking more clearly were they to affirm that the sacraments are instituted solely to foster the faith—but this is condemned by the Council of Trent: "If any one say that these sacraments are instituted solely to foster the faith, let him be anathema." (Sess. VII. de Sacramentis in genere, can 5.)

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

We have already touched upon the nature and origin of the sacred books. According to the principles of the modernists, they may be rightly described as a collection of experiences; not indeed of the kind that may come to anybody, but those extraordinary and striking ones which have happened in any religion. And this is precisely what they teach about our books of the Old and New Testament. But to suit their own theories they note with remarkable ingenuity that, although experience is something belonging to the present, still it may derive its material from the past and the future alike, inasmuch as the believer by memory lives the past over again after the manner of the present, and lives the future already by anticipation.

This explains how it is that the historical and apocalyptic books are included among the sacred writings. God does indeed speak in these books—through the medium of the believer, but only, according to modernistic theology, by vital immanence and permanence. Do we inquire concerning inspiration? Inspiration, they reply, is distinguished only by its vehemence from that impulse which stimulates the believer to reveal the faith that is in him by words or writing. It is something like what happens in poetical inspiration, of which it has been said: "There is a God in us, and when He stirreth He sets us afire." And it is precisely in this sense that God is said to be the origin of the inspiration of the sacred books. The modernists affirm, too, that there is nothing in these books which is not inspired. In this respect some might be disposed to consider them as more orthodox than certain other moderns, who somewhat restrict inspiration, as, for instance, in what have been put forward as tacit citations. But it is all mere juggling of words. For if we take the Bible, according to the tenets of agnosticism, to be a human work, made by men for men, but allowing the theologian to proclaim that it is divine by immanence, what room is there left in it for inspiration? General inspiration in the modernist sense it is easy to find, but of inspiration in the Catholic sense there is not a trace.

THE CHURCH.

A wider field for comment is opened when you come to treat of the vagaries devised by the modernist school concerning the Church. You must start with the supposition that the Church has its birth in a double need, the need of the individual believer, especially if he has had some original and special experience, to communicate his faith to others, and the need of the Mass when the faith has become common to many, to form itself into a society and to guard, increase and propagate the common good. What, then, is the Church? It is the product of the collective conscience; that is to say, of the society of individual consciences which, by virtue of the principle of vital permanence, all depend on one first believer, who for Catholics is Christ. Now, every society needs a directing authority to guide its members towards the common end, to conserve prudently the elements of cohesion, which in a religious society are doctrine and worship. Hence the triple authority in the Catholic Church—disciplinary, dogmatic, liturgical. The nature of this authority is to be gathered from its origin, and its rights and duties from its nature. In past times it was a common error that authority came to the Church from without; that is to say, directly from God; and it was then rightly held to be autocratic. But this conception has now grown obsolete. For in the same way as the Church is a vital emanation of the collectivity of consciences, so, too, authority emanates vitally from the Church itself. Authority, therefore, like the Church, has its origin in the religious conscience, and, that being so, is subject to it. Should it disown this dependence, it becomes a tyranny. For we are living in an age when the sense of liberty has reached its fullest development, and when the public conscience has in the civil order introduced popular government. Now, there are not two consciences in man, any more than there are two lives. It is for the ecclesiastical authority, therefore, to shape itself to democratic forms, unless it wishes to provoke and foment an intestine conflict in the consciences of mankind. The penalty of refusal is disaster. For it is madness to think that the sentiment of liberty, as it is now spread abroad, can surrender. Were it forcibly confined and held in bonds, terrible would be its outburst, sweeping away at once both Church and religion. Such is the situation for the modernists, and their one great anxiety is, in consequence, to find a way of conciliation between the authority of the Church and the liberty of believers.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

But it is not with its own members alone that the Church must come to an amicable arrangement—besides its relations with those within, it has others outside. The Church does not occupy the world all by itself; there are other societies in the world, with which it must necessarily have contact and relations. The rights and duties of the Church towards civil societies must, therefore, be determined, and determined, of course, by its own nature, as it has been already described. The rules to be applied in this matter are those which have been laid down for science and faith, though in the latter case the question is one of objects, while here we have one of ends. In the same way, then, as faith and science are strangers to each other, by reason of the diversity of their objects, Church and State are strangers by reason of the diversity of their ends, that of the Church being spiritual, while that of the State is temporal. Formerly it was possible to subordinate the temporal to the spiritual, and to speak of some

questions as mixed, allowing to the Church the position of queen and mistress in all such, because the Church was then regarded as having been instituted immediately by God as the author of the supernatural order. But this doctrine is to-day repudiated alike by philosophy and history. The State must, therefore, be separated from the Church, and the Catholic from the citizen. Every Catholic, from the fact that he is also a citizen, has the right and the duty to work for the common good in the way he thinks best, without troubling himself about the authority of the Church, without paying any heed to its wishes, its counsels, its orders—nay, even in spite of its reprimands. To trace out and prescribe for the citizen any line of conduct, on any pretext whatsoever, is to be guilty of an abuse of ecclesiastical authority, against which one is bound to act with all one's might. The principles from which these doctrines spring have been solemnly condemned by our predecessor, Pius VI., in his Constitution "Austorem fidei." (Prop. 2. "Propositio, quae statuit, potestatem a Deo datam Ecclesiae ut communicaretur Pastoribus, qui sunt eius ministri pro salute animarum; sic intellecta, ut a communitate fidelium in Pastores derivetur ecclesiastici ministerii ac regiminis potestas; haeretica.")—Prop. 3. "Insuper, quae statuit Romanum Pontificem esse caput ministeriale; sic explicata ut Romanus Pontifex non a Christo in persona beati Petri, sed ab Ecclesia potestatem ministerii accipiat, qua velut Petri successor, verus Christi vicarius ac totius Ecclesiae caput pollet in universa Ecclesia; haeretica.")

THE MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH.

But it is not enough for the modernist school that the State should be separated from the Church. For as faith is to be subordinated to science, as far as phenomenal elements are concerned, so, too, in temporal matters the Church must be subject to the State. They do not say this openly as yet, but they will say it when they wish to be logical on this head. For, given the principle that in temporal matters the State possesses absolute mastery, it will follow that when the believer, not fully satisfied with his merely internal acts of religion, proceeds to external acts, such, for instance, as the administration or reception of the sacraments, these will fall under the control of the State. What will then become of ecclesiastical authority, which can only be exercised by external acts? Obviously, it will be completely under the dominion of the State. It is this inevitable consequence which impels many among liberal Protestants to reject all external worship, nay, all external religious community, and makes them advocate what they call individual religion. If the modernists have not yet reached this point, they do ask the Church in the meanwhile to be good enough to follow spontaneously where they lead her and adapt herself to the civil forms in vogue. Such are their ideas about disciplinary authority. But far more advanced and far more pernicious are their teachings on doctrinal and dogmatic authority. This is their conception of the magisterium of the Church: No religious society, they say, can be a real unit unless the religious conscience of its members be one, and one also the formula which they adopt. But this double unity requires a kind of common mind, whose office is to find and determine the formula that corresponds best with the common conscience, and it must have, moreover, an authority sufficient to enable it to impose on the community the formula which has been decided upon. From the combination and, as it were, fusion of these two elements the common mind which draws up the formula and the authority which imposes it arises, according to the modernists, the notion of the ecclesiastical magisterium. And as this magisterium springs, in its last analysis, from the individual consciences and possesses its mandate of public utility for their benefit, it follows that the ecclesiastical magisterium must be subordinate to them, and should therefore take democratic forms. To prevent individual consciences from revealing freely and openly the impulses they feel, to hinder criticism from impelling dogmas towards their necessary evolutions—this is not a legitimate use, but an abuse of a power given for the public utility. So, too, a due method and measure must be observed in the exercise of authority. To condemn and prescribe a work without the knowledge of the author, without hearing his explanations, without discussion, assuredly savors of tyranny. And thus here again a way must be found to save the full rights of authority on the one hand and of liberty on the other. In the meanwhile the proper course for the Catholic will be to proclaim publicly his profound respect for authority—and continue to follow his own bent. Their general directions for the Church may be put in this way: Since the end of the Church is entirely spiritual, the religious authority should strip itself of all that external pomp which adorns it in the eyes of the public. And here they forget that while religion is essentially for the soul, it is not exclusively for the soul, and that the honor paid to authority is reflected back on Jesus Christ, who instituted it.

THE EVOLUTION OF DOCTRINE.

To finish with this whole question of faith and its shoots, it remains to be seen, venerable brethren, what the modernists have to say about their development. First of all, they lay down the general principle that in a living religion everything is subject to change, and must, in fact, change; and in this way they pass to what may be said to be among the chief of their doctrines, that of evolution. To the laws of evolution everything is subject—dogma, Church, worship, the books we revere as sacred, even faith itself—and the penalty of disobedience is death. The enunciation of this principle will not astonish anybody who bears in mind what the modernists have had to say about each of these subjects. Having laid down this law of evolution, the modernists themselves teach us how it works out. And first with regard to faith. The primitive form of faith, they tell us, was rudimentary and common to all men alike, for it had its origin in human nature and human life. Vital evolution brought with it progress, not by the accretion of new and purely adventitious forms from without, but by an increasing penetration of the religious sentiment in the conscience. This progress was of two kinds: negative, by the elimination of all foreign elements, such, for example, as the sentiment of family or nationality; and positive by that intellectual and moral refining of man, by means of which the idea was enlarged and enlightened, while the religious sentiment became more elevated and more intense. For the progress of faith no other causes are to be assigned than those which are adduced to explain its origin. But to them must be added those religious geniuses whom we call prophets, and of whom Christ was the greatest; both because in their lives and their words there was something mysterious which faith attributed to the divinity, and because it fell to their lot to have new and original experiences fully in harmony with the needs of their time. The progress of dogma is due chiefly to the obstacles which faith has to surmount, to the enemies it has to vanquish, to the contradictions it has to repel. Add to this a perpetual striving to penetrate ever more profoundly its own mysteries. Thus, to omit other examples, has it happened in the case of Christ: in Him that divine something which faith admitted in Him expanded in such a way that He was at last held to be God. The chief stimulus of evolution in the domain of worship consists in the need of adapting itself to the uses and customs of peoples, as well as the need of availing itself of the value which certain acts have acquired by long usage. Finally, evolution in the Church itself is fed by the need of accommodating itself to historical conditions and of harmonizing itself with existing forms of society. Such is religious evolution in detail. And here, before proceeding further, we would have you note well this whole theory of necessities and needs, for it is at the root of the entire system of the modernists, and it is upon it that they will erect that famous method of theirs called the historical.

Still continuing the consideration of the evolution of doctrine, it is to be noted that evolution is due no doubt to those stimulants styled needs, but if left to their action alone it would run a great risk of bursting the bounds of tradition, and thus, turned aside from its primitive vital principle, would lead to ruin instead of progress. Hence, studying more closely the ideas of the modernists, evolution is described as resulting from the conflict of two forces, one of them tending towards progress, the other towards conservation. The conserving force in the Church is tradition, and tradition is represented by religious authority, and this both by right and in fact; for by right it is the very nature of authority to protect tradition, and, in fact, for authority, raised as it is above the contingencies of life, feels hardly or not at all the spurs of progress. The progressive force, on the contrary, which responds to the inner needs, lies in the individual conscience and ferments there—especially in such of them as are in most intimate contact with life. Note here, venerable brethren, the appearance already of that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity a factor of progress in the Church. Now, it is by a species of compromise between the forces of conservation and of progress—that is to say, between authority and individual consciences—that changes and advances take place. The individual consciences of some of them act on the collective conscience, which brings pressure to bear on the depositaries of authority until the latter consent to a compromise, and, the pact being made, authority sees to its maintenance.

With all this in mind, one understands how it is that the modernists express astonishment when they are reprimanded or punished. What is imputed to them as a fault they regard as a sacred duty. Being in intimate contact with consciences, they know better than anybody else, and certainly better than the ecclesiastical authority, what needs exist—nay, they embody them, so to speak, in themselves. Having a voice and a pen, they use both publicly, for this is their duty. Let authority rebuke them as much as it

pleases, they have their own conscience on their side and an intimate experience which tells them with certainty that what they deserve is not blame, but praise. Then they reflect that, after all, there is no progress without a battle, and no battle without its victim; and victims they are willing to be, like the prophets and Christ Himself. They have no bitterness in their hearts against the authority which uses them roughly, for, after all, it is only doing its duty as authority. Their sole grief is that it remains deaf to their warnings, because delay multiplies the obstacles which impede the progress of souls, but the hour will most surely come when there will be no further chance for tergiversation, for if the laws of evolution may be checked for awhile, they cannot be ultimately destroyed. And so they go their way, reprimands and condemnations notwithstanding, masking an incredible audacity under a mock semblance of humility. While they make a show of bowing their heads, their hands and minds are more intent than ever on carrying out their purposes. And this policy they follow willingly and wittingly, both because it is part of their system that authority is to be stimulated, but not dethroned, and because it is necessary for them to remain within the ranks of the Church in order that they may gradually transform the collective conscience—thus unconsciously avowing that the common conscience is not with them, and that they have no right to claim to be its interpreters.

Thus, then, venerable brethren, for the modernists, both as authors and propagandists, there is to be nothing stable, nothing immutable in the Church. Nor, indeed, are they without precursors in their doctrines, for it was of these that our predecessor, Pius IX., wrote: "These enemies of divine revelation extol human progress to the skies, and with rash and sacrilegious daring would have it introduced into the Catholic religion, as if this religion were not the work of God, but of man, or some kind of philosophical discovery susceptible of perfection by human efforts." (Encycl. "Qui pluribus," 9 Nov., 1846.) On the subject of revelation and dogma in particular, the doctrine of the modernists offers nothing new. We find it condemned in the syllabus of Pius IX., where it is enunciated in these terms: "Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the progress of human reason." (Syll. Prop. 5.) And condemned still more solemnly in the Vatican Council: "The doctrine of the faith which God has revealed has not been proposed to human intelligences to be perfected by them as if it were a philosophical system, but as a divine deposit entrusted to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted. Hence the sense, too, of the sacred dogmas is that which our Holy Mother the Church has once declared, nor is this sense ever to be abandoned on plea or pretext of a more profound comprehension of the truth." (Const. "Dei Filius," cap. iv.) Nor is the development of our knowledge, even concerning the faith, impeded by this pronouncement; on the contrary, it is aided and promoted. For the same council continues: "Let intelligence and science and wisdom, therefore, increase and progress abundantly and vigorously in individuals and in the mass, in the believer and in the whole Church, throughout the ages and the centuries—but only in its own kind; that is, according to the same dogma, the same sense, the same acceptance." (Loc. cit.)

THE MODERNIST AS HISTORIAN AND CRITIC.

After having studied the modernist as philosopher, believer and theologian, it now remains for us to consider him as historian, critic, apologist, reformer.

Some modernists, devoted to historical studies, seem to be greatly afraid of being taken for philosophers. About philosophy, they tell you, they know nothing whatever—and in this they display remarkable astuteness, for they are particularly anxious not to be suspected of being prejudiced in favor of philosophical theories, which would lay them open to the charge of not being objective, to use the word in vogue. And yet the truth is that their history and their criticism are saturated with their philosophy, and that their historico-critical conclusions are the natural fruit of their philosophical principles. This will be patent to anybody who reflects. Their three first laws are contained in those three principles of their philosophy already dealt with: the principle of agnosticism, the principle of the transfiguration of things by faith, and the principle which we have called disfiguration. Let us see what consequences flow from each of them. Agnosticism tells us that history, like every other science, deals entirely with phenomena, and the consequence is that God, and every intervention of God in human affairs, is to be relegated to the domain of faith as belonging to it alone. In things where a double element, the divine and the human, mingles—in Christ, for example, or the Church, or the sacraments, or the many other objects of the same kind, a division must be made and the human element

assigned to history, while the divine will go to faith. Hence we have that distinction, so current among the modernists, between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith, between the Church of history and the Church of faith, between the sacraments of history and the sacraments of faith, and so on. Next we find that the human element itself, which the historian has to work on as it appears in the documents, has been by faith transfigured; that is to say, raised above its historical conditions. It becomes necessary, therefore, to eliminate also the accretions which faith has added, to assign them to faith itself and to the history of faith. Thus, when treating of Christ the historian must set aside all that surpasses man in his natural condition, either according to the psychological conception of him or according to the place and period of his existence. Finally, by virtue of the third principle even those things which are not outside the sphere of history they pass through the crucible, excluding from history and relegating to faith everything which, in their judgment, is not in harmony with what they call the logic of facts and in character with the persons of whom they are predicted. Thus, they will not allow that Christ ever uttered those things which do not seem to be within the capacity of the multitudes that listened to Him. Hence they delete from His real history and transfer to faith all the allegories found in His discourses. Do you inquire as to the criterion they adopt to enable them to make these divisions? The reply is that they argue from the character of the man, from his condition of life, from his education, from the circumstances under which the facts took place—in fact, from criteria which, when one considers them all, are purely subjective. Their method is to put themselves into the position and person of Christ, and then to attribute to Him what they would have done under like circumstances. In this way, absolutely *a priori* and acting on philosophical principles, which they admit they hold, but which they affect to ignore, they proclaim that Christ, according to what they call His real history, was not God and never did anything divine, and that as man He did and said only what they, judging from the time in which He lived, can admit Him to have said or done.

CRITICISM AND ITS PRINCIPLES.

And as history receives its conclusions ready-made from philosophy, so, too, criticism takes its own from history. The critic, on the data furnished him by the historian, makes two parts of all his documents. Those that remain after the triple elimination above described go to form the real history; the rest is attributed to the history of the faith, or, as it is styled, to internal history. For the modernists distinguish very carefully between these two kinds of history, and it is to be noted that they oppose the history of the faith to real history precisely as real. Thus we have a double Christ: a real Christ and a Christ, the one of faith, who never really existed; a Christ who has lived at a given time and in a given place and a Christ who has never lived outside the pious meditations of the believer—the Christ, for instance, whom we find in the Gospel of St. John, which is pure contemplation from beginning to end.

But the dominion of philosophy over history does not end here. Given that division, of which we have spoken, of the documents into two parts, the philosopher steps in again with his principle of vital immanence, and shows how everything in the history of the Church is to be explained by vital emanation. And since the cause or condition of every vital emanation whatsoever is to be found in some need, it follows that no fact can antedate the need which produced it—historically, the fact must be posterior to the need. See how the historian works on this principle. He goes over his documents again, whether they be found in the sacred books or elsewhere, draws up from them his list of the successive needs of the Church, whether relating to dogma or liturgy or other matters, and then he hands his list over to the critic. The critic takes in hand the documents dealing with the history of faith and distributes them, period by period, so that they correspond with the lists of needs, always guided by the principle that the narration must follow the facts, as the facts follow the needs. It may at times happen that some part of the Sacred Scriptures, such as the Epistles, themselves constitute the fact created by the need. Even so, the rule holds that the age of any document can only be determined by the age in which each need has manifested itself in the Church. Further, a distinction must be made between the beginning of a fact and its development, for what is born one day requires time for growth. Hence the critic must once more go over his documents, ranged as they are through the different ages, and divide them again into two parts, and divide them into two lots, separating those that regard the first stage of the facts from those that deal with their development, and these he must again range according to their periods.

Then the philosopher must come in again to impose on the historian the obligation of following in all his studies the precepts and laws of evolution.

It is next for the historian to scrutinize his documents and conditions affecting the Church during the different periods, the conserving force she has put forth, the needs, both internal and external, that have stimulated her to progress, the obstacles she has had to encounter; in a word, everything that helps to determine the manner in which the laws of evolution have been fulfilled in her. This done, he finishes his work by drawing up in its broad lines a history of the development of the facts. The critic follows and fits in the rest of the documents with this sketch; he takes up his pen and soon the history is made complete. Now we ask here: Who is the author of this history? The historian? The critic? Assuredly, neither of these, but the philosopher. From beginning to end everything in it is "a priori," and "a priori" in a way that reeks of heresy. These men are certainly to be pitied, and of them the apostle might well say: "They became vain in their thoughts . . . professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." (Rom. i., 21, 22.) But at the same time they excite just indignation when they accuse the Church of torturing the texts, arranging and confusing them after its own fashion, and for the needs of its cause. In this they are accusing the Church of something for which their own conscience plainly reproaches them.

HOW THE BIBLE IS DEALT WITH.

The result of this dismembering of the sacred books and this partition of them throughout the centuries is naturally that the Scriptures can no longer be attributed to the authors whose names they bear. The modernists have no hesitation in affirming commonly that these books, and especially the Pentateuch and the first three Gospels, have been gradually formed by additions to a primitive brief narration—by interpolations of theological or allegorical interpretation, by transitions, by joining different passages together. This means, briefly, that in the sacred books we must admit a vital evolution, springing from and corresponding with the evolution of faith. The traces of this evolution, they tell us, are so visible in the books that one might almost write a history of them. Indeed, this history they do actually write, and with such an easy security that one might believe them to have with their own eyes seen the writers at work through the ages amplifying the sacred books. To aid them in this they call to their assistance that branch of criticism which they call textual, and labor to show that such a fact or such a phrase is not in its right place, and adducing other arguments of the same kind. They seem, in fact, to have constructed for themselves certain types of narration and discourses, upon which they base their decision as to whether a thing is out of place or not. Judge if you can how men with such a system are fitted for practicing this kind of criticism. To hear them talk about their works on the sacred books, in which they have been able to discover so much that is defective, one would imagine that before them nobody ever even glanced through the pages of Scripture, whereas the truth is that a whole multitude of doctors, infinitely superior to them in genius, in erudition, in sanctity, have sifted the sacred books in every way, and so far from finding imperfections in them, have thanked God more and more the deeper they have gone into them for His divine bounty in having vouchsafed to speak thus to men. Unfortunately, these great doctors did not enjoy the same aids to study that are possessed by the modernists for their guide and rule—a philosophy borrowed from the negation of God, and a criterion which consists of themselves.

We believe, then, that we have set forth with sufficient clearness the historical method of the modernists. The philosopher leads the way, the historian follows, and then in due order come internal and textual criticism. And since it is characteristic of the first cause to communicate its virtue to secondary causes, it is quite clear that the criticism we are concerned with is an agnostic, immanentist and evolutionist criticism. Hence anybody who embraces it and employs it makes profession thereby of the errors contained in it, and places himself in opposition to Catholic faith. This being so, one cannot but be greatly surprised by the consideration which is attached to it by certain Catholics. Two causes may be assigned for this: First, the close alliance, independent of all differences of nationality and religion, which the historians and critics of this school have formed among themselves; second, the boundless effrontery of these men. Let one of them but open his mouth and the others applaud him in chorus, proclaiming that science has made another step forward. Let an outsider but hint at a desire to inspect the new discovery with his own eyes, and they are on him in a body. Deny it, and you are an ignoramus; embrace it and defend it, and there is no praise too warm for you. In this way they win over many who, did they but realize what they are doing, would shrink back with horror. The impudence and the domineering of some, and the thoughtlessness and

imprudence of others have combined to generate a pestilence in the air which penetrates everywhere and spreads the contagion. But let us pass to the apologist.

THE MODERNIST AS APOLOGIST.

The modernist apologist depends in two ways on the philosopher. First, indirectly, inasmuch as his theme is history—history dictated, as we have seen, by the philosopher; and, secondly, directly, inasmuch as he takes both his laws and his principles from the philosopher. Hence that common precept of the modernist school that the new apologetics must be fed from psychological and historical sources. The modernist apologists, then, enter the arena by proclaiming to the rationalists that though they are defending religion, they have no intention of employing the data of the sacred books or the histories in current use in the Church, and composed according to old methods, but real history, written on modern principles and according to rigorously modern methods. In all this they are not using an "*argumentum ad hominem*," but are stating the simple fact that they hold that the truth is to be found only in this kind of history. They feel that it is not necessary for them to dwell on their own sincerity in their writings—they are already known to and praised by the rationalists as fighting under the same banner, and they not only plume themselves on these encomiums, which are a kind of salary to them, but would only provoke nausea in a real Catholic, but use them as an offset to the reprimands of the Church.

But let us see how the modernist conducts his apologetics. The aim he sets before himself is to make the non-believer attain that experience of the Catholic religion which, according to the system, is the basis of faith. There are two ways open to him, the objective and the subjective. The first of them proceeds from agnosticism. It tends to show that religion, and especially the Catholic religion, is endowed with such vitality as to compel every psychologist and historian of good faith to recognize that its history hides some unknown element. To this end it is necessary to prove that this religion, as it exists to-day, is that which was founded by Jesus Christ; that is to say, that it is the product of the progressive development of the germ which He brought into the world. Hence it is imperative first of all to establish what this germ was, and this the modernist claims to be able to do by the following formula: Christ announced the coming of the kingdom of God, which was to be realized within a brief lapse of time, and of which He was to become the Messiah, the divinely-given agent and ordainer. Then it must be shown how this germ, always immanent and permanent in the bosom of the Church, has gone on slowly developing in the course of history, adapting itself successively to the different mediums through which it has passed, borrowing from them by vital assimilation all the dogmatic, cultural, ecclesiastical forms that served its purpose; whilst, on the other hand, it surmounted all obstacles, vanquished all enemies and survived all assaults and all combats. Anybody who well and duly considers this mass of obstacles, adversaries, attacks, combats and the vitality and fecundity which the Church has shown throughout them all must admit that if the laws of evolution are visible in her life, they fail to explain the whole of her history—the unknown rises forth from it and presents itself before us. Thus do they argue, never suspecting that their determination of the primitive germ is an "*a priori*" of agnostic and evolutionist philosophy, and that the formula of it has been gratuitously invented for the sake of buttressing their position.

But while they endeavor by this line of reasoning to secure access for the Catholic religion into souls, these new apologists are quite ready to admit that there are many distasteful things in it. Nay, they admit openly, and with ill-concealed satisfaction, that they have found that even its dogma is not exempt from errors and contradictions. They add also that this is not only excusable, but, curiously enough, even right and proper. In the sacred books there are many passages referring to science or history where manifest errors are to be found. But the subject of these books is not science or history, but religion and morals. In them history and science serve only as a species of covering to enable the religious and moral experiences wrapped up in them to penetrate more readily among the masses. The masses understood science and history as they are expressed in these books, and it is clear that had science and history been expressed in a more perfect form this would have proved rather a hindrance than a help. Then, again, the sacred books being essentially religious, are consequently necessarily living. Now, life has its own truth and its own logic—quite different from rational truth and rational logic, belonging as they do to a different order, viz., truth of adaptation and of proportion both with the medium in which it exists and with the end towards which it tends. Finally, the

modernists, losing all sense of control, go so far as to proclaim as true and legitimate everything that is explained by life.

We, venerable brethren, for whom there is but one and only truth, and who hold that the sacred books, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, have God for their author (Conc. Vat., *De Revel.*, c. 2), declare that this is equivalent to attributing to God Himself the lie of utility or officious lie, and we say with St. Augustine: "In an authority so high, admit but one officious lie, and there will not remain a single passage of those apparently difficult to practice or to believe, which on the same most pernicious rule may not be explained as a lie uttered by the author willfully and to serve a purpose." (Epist. 28.) And thus it will come about, the holy doctor continues, that everybody will believe and refuse to believe what he likes or dislikes. But the modernists pursue their way gaily. They grant also that certain arguments adduced in the sacred books, like those, for example, which are based on the prophecies, have no rational foundation to rest on. But they will defend even these as artifices of preaching, which are justified by life. Do they stop here? No, indeed; for they are ready to admit, nay, to proclaim, that Christ Himself manifestly erred in determining the time when the coming of the kingdom of God was to take place, and they tell us that we must not be surprised at this, since even Christ was subject to the laws of life! After this, what is to become of the dogmas of the Church? The dogmas brim over with flagrant contradictions, but what matter that, since, apart from the fact that vital logic accepts them, they are not repugnant to symbolical truth. Are we not dealing with the infinite, and has not the infinite an infinite variety of aspects? In short, to maintain and defend these theories they do not hesitate to declare that the noblest homage that can be paid to the Infinite is to make it the object of contradictory propositions! But when they justify even contradictions, what is it that they will refuse to justify?

SUBJECTIVE ARGUMENTS.

But it is not solely by objective arguments that the non-believer may be disposed to faith. There are also subjective ones at the disposal of the modernists, and for those they return to their doctrine of immanence. They endeavor, in fact, to persuade their non-believer that down in the very depths of his nature and his life lie the need and the desire for religion, and this not a religion of any kind, but the specific religion known as Catholicism, which, they say, is absolutely postulated by the perfect development of life. And here we cannot but deplore once more, and grievously, that there are Catholics who, while rejecting immanence as a doctrine, employ it as a method of apologetics, and who do this so imprudently that they seem to admit that there is in human nature a true and rigorous necessity with regard to the supernatural order—and not merely a capacity and a suitability for the supernatural, such as has at all times been emphasized by Catholic apologists. Truth to tell, it is only the moderate modernists who make this appeal to an exigency for the Catholic religion. As for the others, who might be called integralists, they would show to the non-believer, hidden away in the very depths of his being, the very germ which Christ Himself bore in His conscience, and which He bequeathed to the world. Such, venerable brethren, is a summary description of the apologetic method of the modernists, in perfect harmony, as you may see, with their doctrines—methods and doctrines brimming over with errors, made not for edification, but for destruction; not for the formation of Catholics, but for the plunging of Catholics into heresy; methods and doctrines that would be fatal to any religion.

THE MODERNIST AS REFORMER.

It remains for us now to say a few words about the modernist as reformer. From all that has preceded, some idea may be gained of the reforming mania which possesses them: in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. Reform of philosophy, especially in the seminaries: the scholastic philosophy is to be relegated to the history of philosophy among obsolete systems, and the young men are to be taught modern philosophy, which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. Reform of theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma. As for history, it must be for the future written and taught only according to their modern methods and principles. Dogmas and their evolution are to be harmonized with science and history. In the catechism no dogmas are to be inserted except those that have been duly reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding worship, the number of external devotions is to be reduced, or at least steps must be taken to prevent their further increase, though, indeed, some of the

admirers of symbolism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head. Ecclesiastical government requires to be reformed in all its branches, but especially in its disciplinary and dogmatic parts. Its spirit and its external manifestations must be put in harmony with the public conscience, which is now wholly for democracy; a share in ecclesiastical government should therefore be given to the lower ranks of the clergy, and even to the laity, and authority should be decentralized. The Roman congregations, and especially the Index and the Holy Office, are to be reformed. The ecclesiastical authority must change its line of conduct in the social and political world; while keeping outside political and social organization, it must adapt itself to those which exist in order to penetrate them with its spirit. With regard to morals, they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive, both in the estimation in which they must be held and in the exercise of them. The clergy are asked to return to their ancient lowliness and poverty, and in their ideas and action to be guided by the principles of modernism; and there are some who, echoing the teaching of their Protestant masters, would like the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy. What is there left in the Church which is not to be reformed according to their principles?

MODERNISM AND ALL THE HERESIES.

It may be, venerable brethren, that some may think we have dwelt too long on this exposition of the doctrines of the modernists. But it was necessary, both in order to refute their customary charge that we do not understand their ideas and to show that their system does not consist in scattered and unconnected theories, but in a perfectly organized body, all the parts of which are solidly joined, so that it is not possible to admit one without admitting all. For this reason, too, we have had to give this exposition a somewhat didactic form and not to shrink from employing certain uncouth terms in use among the modernists. And now can anybody who takes a survey of the whole system be surprised that we should define it as the synthesis of all heresies? Were one to attempt the task of collecting together all the errors that have been broached against the faith and to concentrate the sap and substance of them all into one, he could not better succeed than the modernists have done. Nay, they have done more than this, for, as we have already intimated, their system means the destruction not of the Catholic religion alone, but of all religion. With good reason do the rationalists applaud them, for the most sincere and the frankest among the rationalists warmly welcome the modernists as their most valuable allies.

For let us return for a moment, venerable brethren, to that most disastrous doctrine of agnosticism. By it every avenue that leads the intellect to God is barred, but the modernists would seek to open others available for sentiment and action. Vain efforts! For, after all, what is sentiment but the reaction of the soul on the action of the intelligence or the senses? Take away the intelligence, and man, already inclined to follow the senses, becomes their slave. Vain, too, from another point of view, for all these fantasias on the religious sentiment will never be able to destroy common sense, and common sense tells us that emotion and everything that leads the heart captive proves a hindrance instead of a help to the discovery of truth. We speak, of course, of truth in itself—as for that other purely subjective truth, the fruit of sentiment and action, if it serves its purpose for the jugglery of words, it is of no use to the man who wants to know above all things whether outside himself there is a God into whose hands he is one day to fall. True, the modernists do call in experience to eke out their system, but what does this experience add to sentiment? Absolutely nothing beyond a certain intensity and a proportionate deepening of the conviction of the reality of the object. But these two will never make sentiment into anything but sentiment, nor deprive it of its characteristic, which is to cause deception when the intelligence is not there to guide it; on the contrary, they but confirm and aggravate this characteristic, for the more intense sentiment is, the more it is sentimental. In matters of religious sentiment and religious experience, you know, venerable brethren, how necessary is prudence, and how necessary, too, the science which directs prudence. You know it from your own dealings with souls, and especially with souls in whom sentiment predominates; you know it also from your reading of ascetical books—books for which the modernists have but little esteem, but which testify to a science and a solidity very different from theirs, and to a refinement and subtlety of observation of which the modernists give no evidence. Is it not really folly, or at least sovereign imprudence, to trust one's self without control to modernists' experiences? Let us for a moment put the question: If experiences have so much value in their eyes, why do they not attach equal weight to the experience that thousands upon thousands of Catholics have that the modernists are on the

wrong road? Is it, perchance, that all experiences except those felt by the modernists are false and deceptive? The vast majority of mankind holds, and always will hold firmly, that sentiment and experience alone, when not enlightened and guided by reason, do not lead to the knowledge of God. What remains, then, but the annihilation of all religion—atheism? Certainly it is not the doctrine of symbolism that will save us from this. For if all the intellectual elements, as they call them, of religion are pure symbols, will not the very name of God or of divine personality be also a symbol? And if this be admitted, will not the personality of God become a matter of doubt and the way opened to pantheism? And to pantheism that other doctrine of the divine immanence leads directly. For does it, we ask, leave God distinct from man or not? If yes, in what does it differ from Catholic doctrine, and why reject external revelation? If no, we are at once in pantheism. Now, the doctrine of immanence in the modernist acceptance holds and professes that every phenomenon of conscience proceeds from man as man. The rigorous conclusion of this is the identity of man with God, which means pantheism. The same conclusion follows from the distinction modernists make between science and faith. The object of science, they say, is the reality of the knowable. Now, what makes the unknowable unknowable is its disproportion with the intelligible—a disproportion which nothing whatever, even in the doctrine of the modernist, can suppress. Hence the unknowable remains, and will eternally remain, unknowable to the believer as well as to the man of science. Therefore, if any religion at all is possible, it can only be the religion of an unknowable reality. And why this religion might not be that universal soul of the universe, of which a rationalist speaks, is something we do not see. Certainly, this suffices to show superabundantly by how many roads modernism leads to the annihilation of all religion. The first step in this direction was taken by Protestantism; the second is made by modernism; the next will plunge headlong into atheism.

PART II.

THE CAUSE OF MODERNISM.

To penetrate still deeper into modernism, and to find a suitable remedy for such a deep sore, it behooves us, venerable brethren, to investigate the causes which have engendered it and which foster its growth. That the proximate and immediate cause consists in a perversion of the mind cannot be open to doubt. The remote causes seem to us to be reduced to two: curiosity and pride. Curiosity by itself, if not prudently regulated, suffices to explain all errors. Such is the opinion of our predecessor, Gregory XVI., who wrote: "A lamentable spectacle is that presented by the aberrations of human reason when it yields to the spirit of novelty, when, against the warnings of the apostle, it seeks to know beyond what it is meant to know; and when relying too much on itself it thinks it can find the truth outside the Church, wherein truth is found without the slightest shadow of error." (Ep. Encycl. Singulari nos, 7 Kal., July, 1834.)

But it is pride which exercises an incomparably greater sway over the soul to blind it and plunge into error; and pride sits in modernism as in its own house, finding sustenance everywhere in its doctrines and an occasion to flaunt itself in all its aspects. It is pride which fills modernists with that confidence in themselves and leads them to hold themselves up as the rule for all, pride which puffs them up with that vainglory which allows them to regard themselves as the sole possessors of knowledge and makes them say, inflated with presumption, "We are not as the rest of men," and which, to make them really not as other men, leads them to embrace all kinds of the most absurd novelties. It is pride which rouses in them the spirit of disobedience, and causes them to demand a compromise between authority and liberty; it is pride that makes of them the reformers of others, while they forget to reform themselves, and which begets their absolute want of respect for authority, not excepting the supreme authority. No, truly, there is no road which leads so directly and so quickly to modernism as pride. When a Catholic layman or a priest forgets that precept of the Christian life which obliges us to renounce ourselves if we would follow Jesus Christ, and neglects to tear pride from his heart, ah! but he is a fully ripe subject for the errors of modernism. Hence, venerable brethren, it will be your first duty to thwart such proud men, to employ them only in the lowest and obscurest offices; the higher they try to rise, the lower let them be placed, so that their lowly position may deprive them of the power of causing damage. Sound your young clerics, too, most carefully, by yourselves and by the directors of your seminaries, and when you find the spirit of pride among any of them, reject them with-

out compunction from the priesthood. Would to God that this had always been done with the proper vigilance and constancy.

If we pass from the moral to the intellectual causes of modernism, the first which presents itself, and the chief one, is ignorance. Yes, these very modernists who pose as doctors of the Church, who puff out their cheeks when they speak of modern philosophy, and show such contempt for scholasticism, have embraced the one with all its false glamor because their ignorance of the other has left them without the means of being able to recognize confusion of thought, and to refute sophistry. Their whole system, with all its errors, has been born of the alliance between faith and false philosophy.

METHODS OF PROPAGANDISM.

If only they had displayed less zeal and energy in propagating it! But such is their activity and such their unwearying capacity for work on behalf of their cause that one cannot but be pained to see them waste such labor in endeavoring to ruin the Church when they might have been of such service to her had their efforts been better employed. Their artifices to delude men's minds are of two kinds, the first to remove obstacles from their path, the second to devise and apply actively and patiently every instrument that can serve their purpose. They recognize that the three chief difficulties for them are scholastic philosophy, the authority of the fathers and tradition, and the magisterium of the Church, and on these they wage unrelenting war. For scholastic philosophy and theology they have only ridicule and contempt. Whether it is ignorance or fear, or both, that inspires this conduct in them, certain it is that the passion for novelty is always united in them with hatred of scholasticism, and there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system. Modernists and their admirers should remember the proposition condemned by Pius IX.: "The method and principles which have served the doctors of scholasticism when treating of theology no longer correspond with the exigencies of our time or the progress of science." (Syll. Prop. 13.) They exercise all their ingenuity in diminishing the force and falsifying the character of tradition, so as to rob it of all its weight. But for Catholics the second Council of Nicea will always have the force of law, where it condemns those "who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the ecclesiastical traditions, to invent novelties of some kind . . . or endeavor by malice or craft to overthrow any of the legitimate traditions of the Catholic Church." And Catholics will hold for law also the profession of the fourth Council of Constantinople: "We therefore profess to conserve and guard the rules bequeathed to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church by the holy and most illustrious apostles, by the orthodox councils, both general and local, and by every one of those divine interpreters, the fathers and doctors of the Church." Wherefore, the Roman Pontiffs, Pius IV. and Pius IX., ordered the insertion in the profession of faith of the following declaration: "I most firmly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and other observations and constitutions of the Church." The modernists pass the same judgment on the most holy fathers of the Church as they pass on tradition, decreeing, with amazing effrontery, that, while personally most worthy of all veneration, they were entirely ignorant of history and criticism, for which they are only excusable on account of the time in which they lived. Finally, the modernists try in every way to diminish and weaken the authority of the ecclesiastical magisterium itself by sacrilegiously falsifying its origin, character and rights, and by freely repeating the calumnies of its adversaries. To all the band of modernists may be applied those words which our predecessor wrote with such pain: "To bring contempt and odium on the mystic Spouse of Christ, who is the true light, the children of darkness have been wont to cast in her face before the world a stupid calumny, and perverting the meaning and force of things and words, to depict her as the friend of darkness and ignorance and the enemy of light, science and progress" (*Motu-proprio*, *Ut mysticum*, 14 March, 1891). This being so, venerable brethren, no wonder the modernists vent all their gall and hatred on Catholics who sturdily fight the battles of the Church. But of all the insults they heap on them, those of ignorance and obstinacy are the favorites. When an adversary rises up against them with an erudition and force that render him redoubtable, they try to make a conspiracy of silence around him to nullify the effects of his attack, while, in flagrant contrast with this policy towards Catholics, they load with constant praise the writers who range themselves on their side, hailing their works, exuding novelty in every page, with choruses of applause; for them the scholarship of a writer is in direct proportion to the recklessness of his attacks on antiquity, and of his efforts to undermine tradition and the ecclesiastical magisterium. When one of their number falls under the condemnations of

the Church, the rest of them, to the horror of good Catholics, gather around him, heap public praise upon him, venerate him almost as a martyr of truth. The young, excited and confused by all this clamor of praise and abuse, some of them afraid of being branded as ignorant, others ambitious to be considered learned, and both classes, goaded internally by curiosity and pride, often surrender and give themselves up to modernism.

And here we have already some of the artifices employed by modernists to exploit their wares. What efforts they make to win new recruits! They seize upon chairs in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence. From these sacred chairs they scatter, though not always openly, the seeds of their doctrines; they proclaim their teachings without disguise in congresses; they introduce them and make them the vogue in social institutions. Under their own names and under pseudonyms they publish numbers of books, newspapers, reviews, and sometimes one and the same writer adopts a variety of pseudonyms to trap the incautious reader into believing in a whole multitude of modernist writers—in short, they leave nothing untried, in action, discourses, writings, as though there was a frenzy of propaganda upon them. And the results of all this? We have to lament at the sight of many young men, once full of promise and capable of rendering great services to the Church, now gone astray. And there is another sight that saddens us, too—that of so many other Catholics who, while they certainly do not go so far as the former, have yet grown into the habit, as though they had been breathing a poisoned atmosphere, of thinking and speaking and writing with a liberty that ill becomes Catholics. They are to be found among the laity and in the ranks of the clergy, and they are not wanting even in the last place where one might expect to meet them—in religious institutes. If they treat of Biblical questions, it is upon modernist principles; if they write history, it is to search out with curiosity and to publish openly, on the pretext of telling the whole truth and with a species of ill-concealed satisfaction, everything that looks to them like a stain in the history of the Church. Under the sway of certain *a priori* rules, they destroy as far as they can the pious traditions of the people, and bring ridicule on certain relics highly venerable from their antiquity. They are possessed by the empty desire of being talked about, and they know they would never succeed in this were they to say only what has been always said. It may be that they have persuaded themselves that in all this they are really serving God and the Church—in reality they only offend both, less perhaps by their works themselves than by the spirit in which they write and by the encouragement they are giving to the extravagances of the modernists.

PART III.

REMEDIES.

Against this host of grave errors, and its secret and open advance, our predecessor, Leo XIII., of happy memory, worked strenuously, especially as regards the Bible, both in his words and his acts. But, as we have seen, the modernists are not easily deterred by such weapons; with an affectation of submission and respect they proceeded to twist the words of the Pontiff to their own sense, and his acts they described as directed against others than themselves. And the evil has gone on increasing from day to day. We therefore, venerable brethren, have determined to adopt at once the most efficacious measure in our power, and we beg and conjure you to see to it that in this most grave matter nobody will ever be able to say that you have been in the slightest degree wanting in vigilance, zeal or firmness. And what we ask of you and expect of you we ask and expect also of all other pastors of souls, of all educators and professors of clerics, and in a very special way of the superiors of religious institutions.

I. THE STUDY OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY.

I. In the first place, with regard to studies, we will and ordain that scholastic philosophy be made the basis of the sacred sciences. It goes without saying that if anything is met with among the scholastic doctors which may be regarded as an excess of subtlety, or which is altogether destitute of probability, we have no desire whatever to propose it for the imitation of present generations. (Leo XIII. Enc. "Aeterni Patris.") And let it be clearly understood above all things that the scholastic philosophy we prescribe is that which the Angelic Doctor has bequeathed to us, and we, therefore, declare that all the ordinances of our predecessor on this subject continue fully in force, and, as far as may be necessary, we do decree anew and confirm and ordain that they be by all strictly observed. In seminaries where they may have been neglected let the Bishops impose

them and require their observance, and let this apply also to the superiors of religious institutions. Further, let professors remember that they cannot set St. Thomas aside, especially in metaphysical questions, without grave detriment.

On this philosophical foundation the theological edifice is to be solidly raised. Promote the study of theology, venerable brethren, by all means in your power, so that your clerics on leaving the seminaries may admire and love it, and always find their delight in it. For in the vast and varied abundance of studies opening before the mind desirous of truth everybody knows how the old maxim describes theology as so far in front of all others that every science and art should serve it and be to it as hand-maidens. (Leo XIII., Lett. ap. "In Magna," Dec. 10, 1889.) We will add that we deem worthy of praise those who, with full respect for tradition, the Holy Fathers and the ecclesiastical magisterium, undertake, with well-balanced judgment, and guided by Catholic principles (which is not always the case), seek to illustrate positive theology by throwing the light of true history upon it. Certainly, more attention must be paid to positive theology than in the past, but this must be done without detriment to scholastic theology, and those are to be disapproved as of modernist tendencies who exalt positive theology in such a way as to seem to despise the scholastic.

With regard to profane studies, suffice it to recall here what our predecessor has admirably said: "Apply yourselves energetically to the study of natural sciences: the brilliant discoveries and the bold and useful applications of them made in our times, which have won such applause by our contemporaries, will be an object of perpetual praise for those that come after us." (Leo XIII. Alloc., March 7, 1880.) But this do without interfering with sacred studies, as our predecessor in these most grave words prescribed: "If you carefully search for the cause of those errors, you will find that it lies in the fact that in these days, when the natural sciences absorb so much study, the more severe and lofty studies have been proportionately neglected; some of them have almost passed into oblivion, some of them are pursued in a half-hearted or superficial way, and, sad to say, now that they are fallen from their old estate, they have been disfigured by perverse doctrines and monstrous errors (*loco cit*). We ordain, therefore, that the study of natural science in the seminaries be carried on under this law."

II. PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

II. All these prescriptions and those of our predecessor are to be borne in mind whenever there is question of choosing directors and professors for seminaries and Catholic universities. Anybody who in any way is found to be imbued with modernism is to be excluded without compunction from these offices, and those who already occupy them are to be withdrawn. The same policy is to be adopted towards those who favor modernism either by extolling the modernists or excusing their culpable conduct, by criticizing scholasticism, the Holy Father, or by refusing obedience to ecclesiastical authority in any of its depositories; and towards those who show a love of novelty in history, archaeology, Biblical exegesis, and finally towards those who neglect the sacred sciences or appear to prefer them to the profane. In all this question of studies, venerable brethren, you cannot be too watchful or too constant, but most of all in the choice of professors, for as a rule the students are modeled after the pattern of their masters. Strong in the consciousness of your duty, act always prudently, but vigorously.

Equal diligence and severity are to be used in examining and selecting candidates for holy orders. Far, far from the clergy be the love of novelty! God hates the proud and the obstinate. For the future the doctorate of theology and canon law must never be conferred on anybody who has not made the regular course of scholastic philosophy; if conferred, it shall be held as null and void. The rules laid down in 1896 by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the clerics, both secular and regular, of Italy, concerning the frequenting of the universities, we now decree to be extended to all nations. Clerics and priests inscribed in a Catholic institute or university must not in the future follow in civil universities those courses for which there are chairs in the Catholic institutes to which they belong. If this has been permitted anywhere in the past, we ordain that it be not allowed for the future. Let the Bishops who form the governing board of such Catholic institutes or universities watch with all care that these our commands be constantly observed.

III. EPISCOPAL VIGILANCE OVER PUBLICATIONS.

III. It is also the duty of the Bishops to prevent writings infected with modernism or favorable to it from being read when they have been published, and to hinder their publication when they have not. No book or

paper or periodical of this kind must ever be permitted to seminarists or university students. The injury to them would be equal to that caused by immoral reading—nay, it would be greater, for such writings poison Christian life at its very fount. The same decision is to be taken concerning the writings of some Catholics, who, though not badly disposed themselves, but ill instructed in theological studies and imbued with modern philosophy, strive to make this harmonize with the faith, and, as they say, to turn it to the account of the faith. The name and reputation of these authors cause them to be read without suspicion, and they are, therefore, all the more dangerous in preparing the way for modernism.

To give you some more general directions, venerable brethren, in a matter of such moment, we bid you do everything in your power to drive out of your dioceses, even by solemn interdict, any pernicious books that may be in circulation there. The Holy See neglects no means to put down writings of this kind, but the number of them has now grown to such an extent that it is impossible to censure them all. Hence it happens that the medicine sometimes arrives too late, for the disease has taken root during the delay. We will, therefore, that the Bishops, putting aside all fear and the prudence of the flesh, despising the outcries of the wicked, gently, by all means, but constantly, do each his own share of this work, remembering the injunctions of Leo XIII. in the Apostolic Constitution "Officiorum:" "Let the ordinaries, acting in this also as delegates of the Apostolic See, exert themselves to proscribe and to put out of reach of the faithful injurious books or other writings printed or circulated in their dioceses." In this passage the Bishops, it is true, receive a right, but they have also a duty imposed on them. Let no Bishop think that he fulfills this duty by denouncing to us one or two books while a great many others of the same kind are being published and circulated. Nor are you to be deterred by the fact that a book has obtained the "imprimatur" elsewhere, both because this may be merely simulated and because it may have been granted through carelessness or easiness or excessive confidence in the author, as may sometimes happen in religious orders. Besides, just as the same food does not agree equally with everybody, it may happen that a book harmless in one way, on account of the different circumstances, be hurtful in another. Should a Bishop, therefore, after having taken the advice of prudent persons, deem it right to condemn any of such books in his diocese, we not only give him ample faculty to do so, but we impose it upon him as a duty to do so. Of course, it is our wish that in such action proper regard be used, and sometimes it will suffice to restrict the prohibition to the clergy; but even in such cases it will be obligatory on Catholic booksellers not to put on sale books condemned by the Bishop. And while we are on this subject of booksellers we wish the Bishops to see to it that they do not, through desire for gain, put on sale unsound books. It is certain that in the catalogues of some of them the books of the modernists are not infrequently announced with no small praise. If they refuse obedience, let the Bishops have no hesitation in depriving them of the title of Catholic booksellers; so, too, and with more reason, if they have the title of episcopal booksellers, and if they have that of pontifical let them be denounced to the Apostolic See. Finally, we remind all of the twenty-sixth article of the above-mentioned Constitution "Officiorum:" "All those who have obtained an apostolic faculty to read and keep forbidden books are not thereby authorized to read books and periodicals forbidden by the local ordinaries, unless the apostolic faculty expressly concedes permission to read and keep books condemned by anybody."

IV. CENSORSHIP.

IV. But it is not enough to hinder the reading and the sale of bad books: it is also necessary to prevent them from being printed. Hence, let the Bishops use the utmost severity in granting permission to print. Under the rules of the Constitution "Officiorum," many publications require the authorization of the ordinary, and in some dioceses it has been made the custom to have a suitable number of official censors for the examination of writings. We have the highest praise for this institution, and we not only exhort, but we order that it be extended to all dioceses. In all episcopal curias, therefore, let censors be appointed for the revision of works intended for publication, and let the censors be chosen from both ranks of the clergy, secular and regular, men of age, knowledge and prudence, who will know how to follow the golden mean in their judgments. It shall be their office to examine everything which requires permission for publication according to Articles XLI. and XLII. of the above-mentioned constitution. The censor shall give his verdict in writing. If it be favorable, the Bishop will give the permission for publication by the word "Imprimatur," which must always be preceded by the "Nihil obstat" and the name of the censor. In the Curia of Rome official censors shall be appointed just

as elsewhere, and the appointment of them shall appertain to the master of the sacred palaces, after they have been proposed to the Cardinal Vicar and accepted by the Sovereign Pontiff. It will also be the office of the master of the sacred palaces to select the censor for each writing. Permission for publication will be granted by him as well as by the Cardinal Vicar or his vicegerent; and this permission, as above prescribed, must always be preceded by the "Nihil obstat" and the name of the censor. Only on very rare and exceptional occasions, and on the prudent decision of the Bishop, shall it be possible to omit mention of the censor. The name of the censor shall never be made known to the authors until he shall have given a favorable decision, so that he may not have to suffer annoyance either while he is engaged in the examination of a writing or in case he should deny his approval. Censors shall never be chosen from the religious orders until the opinion of the provincial, or, in Rome, of the general, has been privately obtained; and the provincial or the general must give a conscientious account of the character, knowledge and orthodoxy of the candidate. We admonish religious superiors of their solemn duty never to allow anything to be published by any of their subjects without permission from themselves and from the ordinary. Finally, we affirm and declare that the title of censor has no value, and can never be adduced to give credit to the private opinions of the person who holds it.

PRIESTS AS EDITORS.

Having said this much in general, we now ordain in particular a more careful observance of Article XLII. of the above-mentioned Constitution "Officiorum." It is forbidden to secular priests, without the previous consent of the ordinary, to undertake the direction of papers or periodicals. This permission shall be withdrawn from any priest who makes a wrong use of it after having been admonished. With regard to priests who are correspondents or collaborators of periodicals, as it happens not unfrequently that they write matter infected with modernism for their papers or periodicals, let the Bishops see to it that this is not permitted to happen, and should it happen, let them warn the writers or prevent them from writing. The superiors of religious orders, too, we admonish with all authority to do the same; and should they fail in this duty, let the Bishops make due provision with authority delegated by the Supreme Pontiff. Let there be, as far as this is possible, a special censor for newspapers and periodicals written by Catholics. It shall be his office to read in due time each number after it has been published, and if he find anything dangerous in it, let him order that it be corrected. The Bishop shall have the same right even when the censor has seen nothing objectionable in a publication.

V. CONGRESSES.

V. We have already mentioned congresses and public gatherings as among the means used by the modernists to propagate and defend their opinions. In the future Bishops shall not permit congresses of priests except on very rare occasions. When they do permit them, it shall only be on condition that matters appertaining to the Bishops or the Apostolic See be not treated in them, and that no motions or postulates be allowed that would imply a usurpation of sacred authority; and that no mention be made in them of modernism, presbyterianism or laicism. At congresses of this kind, which can only be held after permission in writing has been obtained in due time and for each case, it shall not be lawful for priests of other dioceses to take part without the written permission of their ordinary. Further, no priest must lose sight of the solemn recommendation of Leo XIII.: "Let priests hold as sacred the authority of their pastors; let them take it for certain that the sacerdotal ministry, if not exercised under the guidance of the Bishops, can never be either holy or very fruitful or respectable." (Lett. Encyc. "Nobilissima Gallorum," 10 Feb., 1884.)

VI. DIOCESAN WATCH COMMITTEES.

VI. But of what avail, venerable brethren, will be all our commands and prescriptions if they be not dutifully and firmly carried out? And in order that this may be done it has seemed expedient to us to extend to all dioceses the regulations laid down with great wisdom many years ago by the Bishops of Umbria for theirs.

"In order," they say, "to extirpate the errors already propagated, and to prevent their further diffusion, and to remove those teachers of impiety through whom the pernicious effects of such diffusion are being perpetuated, this sacred assembly, following the example of St. Charles Borromeo, has decided to establish in each of the dioceses a council consisting of approved members of both branches of the clergy, which shall be charged

with the task of noting the existence of errors and the devices by which new ones are introduced and propagated, and to inform the Bishop of the whole, so that he may take counsel with them as to the best means for nipping the evil in the bud and preventing it spreading for the ruin of souls, or, worse still, gaining strength and growth." (Acts of the Congress of the Bishops of Umbria, Nov., 1849, tit. 2, art. 6.) We decree, therefore, that in every diocese a council of this kind, which we are pleased to name "the Council of Vigilance," be instituted without delay. The priests called to form part in it shall be chosen somewhat after the manner above prescribed for the censors, and they shall meet every two months on an appointed day under the presidency of the Bishop. They shall be bound to secrecy as to their deliberations and decisions, and their function shall be as follows: They shall watch most carefully for every trace and sign of modernism, both in publications and in teaching, and, to preserve from it the clergy and the young, they shall take all prudent, prompt and efficacious measures. Let them combat novelties of words, remembering the admonitions of Leo XIII. (Instruct. S. C. NN. EE. EE., 27 Jan., 1902): "It is impossible to approve in Catholic publications of a style inspired by unsound novelty, which seems to deride the piety of the faithful and dwells on the introduction of a new order of Christian life, on new directions of the Church, on new aspirations of the modern soul, on a new vocation of the clergy, on a new Christian civilization." Language of this kind is not to be tolerated either in books or from chairs of learning. The councils must not neglect the books treating of the pious traditions of different places or of sacred relics. Let them not permit such questions to be discussed in periodicals destined to stimulate piety, neither with expressions savoring of mockery or contempt, nor by dogmatic pronouncements, especially when, as is often the case, what is stated as a certainty either does not pass the limits of probability or is merely based on prejudiced opinion. Concerning sacred relics, let this be the rule: When Bishops, who alone are judges in such matters, know for certain that a relic is not genuine, let them remove it at once from the veneration of the faithful; if the authentications of a relic happen to have been lost through civil disturbances, or in any other way, let it not be exposed for public veneration until the Bishop has verified it. The argument of prescription or well-founded presumption is to have weight only when devotion to a relic is commendable by reason of its antiquity, according to the sense of the decree issued in 1896 by the Congregation of Indulgences and Sacred Relics: "Ancient relics are to retain the veneration they have always enjoyed, except when in individual instances there are clear arguments that they are false or supposititious." In passing judgment on pious traditions, be it always borne in mind that in this matter the Church uses the greatest prudence, and that she does not allow traditions of this kind to be narrated in books except with the utmost caution and with the insertion of the declaration imposed by Urban VIII., and even then she does not guarantee the truth of the fact narrated; she simply does not forbid belief in things for which human arguments are not wanting. On this matter the Sacred Congregation of Rites, thirty years ago, decreed as follows: "These apparitions and revelations have neither been approved nor condemned by the Holy See, which has simply allowed that they be believed on purely human faith, on the tradition which they relate, corroborated by testimonies and documents worthy of credence." (Decree, May 2, 1877.) Anybody who follows this rule has no cause for fear. For the devotion based on any apparition, in as far as it regards the fact itself—that is to say, in as far as it is relative—always implies the hypothesis of the truth of the fact; while in as far as it is absolute, it must always be based on the truth, seeing that its object is the persons of the saints who are honored. The same is true of relics. Finally, we entrust to the Councils of Vigilance the duty of overseeing assiduously and diligently social institutions, as well as writings on social questions, so that they may harbor no trace of modernism, but obey the prescriptions of the Roman Pontiffs.

VII. TRIENNIAL RETURNS.

VII. Lest what we have laid down thus far should fall into oblivion, we will and ordain that the Bishops of all dioceses, a year after the publication of these letters, and every three years thenceforward, furnish the Holy See with a diligent and sworn report on all the prescriptions contained in them, and on the doctrines that find currency among the clergy, and especially in the seminaries and other Catholic institutions, and we impose the like obligation on the generals of religious orders with regard to those under them.

This, venerable brethren, is what we have thought it our duty to write to you for the salvation of all who believe. The adversaries of the Church will doubtless abuse what we have said to refurbish the old calumny by which we are traduced as the enemy of science and of the progress of

humanity. In order to oppose a new answer to such accusations, which the history of the Christian religion refutes by never-failing arguments, it is our intention to establish and develop by every means in our power a special institute in which, through the coöperation of those Catholics who are most eminent for their learning, the progress of science and other realms of knowledge may be promoted under the guidance and teaching of Catholic truth. God grant that we may happily realize our design with the ready assistance of all those who bear a sincere love for the Church of Christ. But of this we will speak on another occasion.

Meanwhile, venerable brethren, fully confident in your zeal and work, we beseech for you with our whole heart and soul the abundance of heavenly light, so that in the midst of this great perturbation of men's minds from the insidious invasions of error from every side, you may see clearly what you ought to do and may perform the task with all your strength and courage. May Jesus Christ, the author and finisher of our faith, be with you by His power; and may the Immaculate Virgin, the destroyer of all heresies, be with you by her prayers and aid. And we, as a pledge of our affection and of divine assistance in adversity, grant most affectionately and with all our heart to you, your clergy and people the apostolic benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 8th day of September, 1907, the fifth year of our pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND UP TO THE DEATH
OF HENRY VIII.

THE great "conquests" of the English in Ireland had dwindled down to a small area round Dublin—smaller than Desmond's property in the south—when Henry VIII. came to the throne of England. All English law was practically limited to the Pale; Kildare was a greater force in Ireland than the English King. Viceroy after viceroy had written home to their Parliaments that there was peace—but there was no peace, and the Irish had never as a race been wholly under English sway. O'Neill and the chiefs obeyed when it suited them and broke off allegiance when they pleased. The governing power was weak; the officials, like vampires, preyed on the poor, and no party suffered so keenly as the English-speaking colonists of the Pale. The latter were doubly taxed—by the Irish chiefs and the ruling English nobles. Brehon law and the clan system were as strong outside the Pale as when Henry II. first came to Dublin. Any one who compares the records of the first Parliaments held in Ireland¹ and the records of Henry VIII.'s reign must see how little was the progress made by English "civilization" during the intervening centuries. The enactments on the statute books, passed for the improvement of Ireland and for its better behavior, were simply futile and puerile. The policy of the Statute of Kilkenny and Poyning's Act were the last efforts of a "superior" race to maintain its individuality. The old law of conquest was reversed; the conquerors were assimilated into the conquered. The English had become "more Irish than the Irish themselves." There was a spirit of rebellion abroad amongst the chieftains, whilst they had no unifying bond of country—each simply fought for the extension or protection of his clan. The chieftain was all; the unit was nothing in this system. Such were the broad conditions in which Ireland was situated in the beginning of Henry's reign.

The Church, too, was in an evil plight; the root principles of its government were evil. There were two sharp divisions in the Irish Church—the one the native Irish element, the other the English priests. The Church was also made subservient to the State, at least that part of it which was English in tone. Though there were many well-meaning men and zealous among the English ecclesiastics, such as Hedian of Cashel, Talbot of Dublin and others, still one would naturally expect that the Irish people would not take kindly to the foreign priests, for they were the kinsmen of those who had

¹ "Irish Archæological Miscellany," Vol. I., p. 15.

brought evil on their land. And such was the case. They were sent over by England and very often filled State positions; they were crown officials—justices, chancellors, executors, etc.—a fact which told in their disfavor. These English ecclesiastics were worldly, shrewd men who watched the political compass in the home country and got decrees passed in the Irish Parliament (such as the non-obtaining of provisions from Rome in Edward III.'s reign (25 Ed. III., Stat. I., 1351), the refusal to pay Peter's pence, etc.), when they knew that such enactments would win favor at home. They were better courtiers than churchmen; they were the open enemies of the Irish.

With disunion amongst the chiefs in Ireland, without one spark of national sentiment in their public actions, the thing called "the Irish nation" did not exist. The Irish Church also stood in need of reform. There was discord among the Irish and English religious orders; there was the need of a stronger central government, of a closer bond of union among its rulers and a general reformation all around. A "Reformation" came which was a Revolution. It produced results which its apostles never dreamt of; it taught the Irish people that they had one common country and one national foe. The Church was freed from the influence of Canterbury and Windsor and was flung on its own native strength. It was no longer a mere State dependent, and though it has passed through a bitter baptism of blood, it has come out from the struggle of the centuries strong and looking bravely towards the future days.

THE PARLIAMENT IN HENRY VIII.'S REIGN.

To understand the reformation in Ireland it is necessary to know something of the constitution of the Irish Parliament of the day. There were two houses, the Upper and the Lower. In the Upper House were the spiritual lords and the peers; the Lower House consisted of members from towns, shires, boroughs and the lower clergy were represented by "proctors." Davies writes:² "Before the 33rd year of Henry VIII. we do not find any to have place in Parliament but the English blood or English of birth onlie—for, the mere Irish in those days were never admitted, as well because their countries lying out of limites of countrye, could send no knights nor burgess to Parliament; and besides that the State did not hold them fit to be trusted with the council of the realm." The Irish were thus excluded. The country in the beginning was divided into fifteen counties, but in Henry VIII.'s time there were only twelve.³ The Upper House, or House of Lords, consisted of peers of the realm,

² Leland, Vol. II., appendix.

³ Ware's "Antiq.," ch. xxvi.

bishops and the superiors of twenty-four religious houses—English, of course. Davies continues, speaking of the “knights in the Lower House:” “Before the 34th year of Henry VIII. the number of knights must have been small, since the ancient cities were but four in number, and the borroughs which sent burgess not above twenty; the entire body cannot have been more than one hundred persons.” Davies does not state that abbots or priors or the proctors representing the lower clergy had any seats in the Lower House; but this fact is indisputable.⁴ Ware gives the names of fourteen abbots and ten priors who “before the suppression had place and voice among the lords in Parliament. But as to their certain number it is far short of what appears in the records.”⁵ The Parliament was wholly a one-sided affair, for Davies in the same document writes: “As for the Archbishops and Bishops, though their number was greater than at present, yet such as were resident in the *mere Irish counties and did not acknowledge the King to be their patron were never summoned to any Parliament.*” Thus by its very constitution the Upper House could not and did not represent the higher Irish classes, lay or clerical. The Lower House was equally exclusive of the Celt. In 1417 it had been made law that “all Archbishops, Bishops, abbots, priors of the Irish nation that shall make any collation or presentment to benefices in Ireland or bring with them any *Irish rebels to the Parliament, councils or assemblies within same land (Ireland) to know the privities or state of Englishmen*, their temporalities shall be seized.”⁶

The question is disputed whether the proctors who represented the lower clergy possessed the right of voting or whether their duties were simply to give advice. Protestant writers would hold that they possessed no such right and were merely clerks to the assembly; but evidence seems to be against this view. The Parliamentary summons ran thus: “To the Archbishops, Bishops, abbots and priors and clerks who hold an earldom.” All these were expected to attend. “To these and to other privileged persons who had jurisdiction, that by the assent of the clergy there may be elected for every deanery and archdeaconry and for themselves, the archdeacons and deacons, *two wise and competent men who were to come and to remain in Parliament to answer and support and consent to do whatever each of the said deaneries would have done if present.*”⁷ From other references it can be shown that the proctors possessed a voting right in Parliament.⁸ The King was of the first degree; the

⁴ Mason, “Parliaments in Ireland,” pp. 51-53.

⁵ Ware’s “Antiquities,” ch. xxvi., p. 116; and “Annals ad an. 1539,” p. 100.

⁶ “Cox Hibernica,” p. 151; “Monasticon Hibernica,” p. 3; “Ware Annals,” ch. xxxi.

⁷ Malone, Vol. II., appendix MM; Ware, “Antiq.,” p. 80.

Archbishops, Bishops, abbots and peers were of the "second degree;" the proctors of the lower clergy were of the third; earls, barons and their peers were of the fourth, and knights of liberties and counties were of the fifth.⁹ Now, if the proctors held only a nominal position in Parliament, they would not get such prominence. As the Bishops, etc., preceded the lay lords in the Upper House, so also the proctors of the clergy took equal prominence among the Commons.

A clerk was appointed to attend to the special business of the proctors, and when a doubtful case came up for discussion members were elected from the proctors as well as from the other degrees to discuss and settle the question. The proctors signed the acts of Parliament as well as the other members of the Parliament.¹⁰ Their voting power is also evident from the statutes of Edward IV.¹¹ In one of these statutes it is stated that "the clergy came at great expense and danger from the Irish enemies," so that the habit grew up of sending bogus representatives for the clergy and borroughs in the remote districts; and it was made law that unless "*proctors* and knights in Parliament should produce their warrants all acts would be declared void."¹² An enactment which shows that proctors held more than a mere nominal position. "The proctors had same privileges as lords."¹³ In fact, the business of Parliament could be conducted by the clergy alone in the absence of the earls,¹⁴ and in 1377 the chapter of Cashel was fined for not sending proctors to the English Parliament. The English King wanted to tax the clergy; the proctors pleaded clerical immunities from such a tax, and that they could not tax themselves in such a case, and that their position then was merely to give advice about such clerical taxation. But the King insisted that they could tax themselves, that it was their right to do so; and accordingly £2,000, a large sum for those days, was voted to him by the proctors. Those representatives of the lower clergy were not present in the early Parliament;¹⁵ but towards the end of the thirteenth century the second order of clergy were summoned and mixed freely, unlike their brethren in the English house, among the members of the council.¹⁶ From all these facts it can be seen that the clergy had an influential voice and a vote in

⁸ "Rothe Analecta," p. 267.

⁹ Ware, *ibid.*

¹⁰ Mason's "Parliament," p. 21.

¹¹ Statutes, 19 Edw. IV., c. xx.; also 18 Edw. IV.; Irish Statutes (Vesey), p. 26.

¹² Robbins' Abridgement, p. 487.

¹³ Liber Munerum (seventh part of Edw. IV.); Robbins, *ibid.*, cap. 3, third year of Edward IV., p. 487; Irish Statutes (Vesey), p. 26.

¹⁴ Malone, p. 71—Selden Prymes.

¹⁵ "Irish Archæological Miscellany," Vol. I., p. 15. Earliest record of Parliament in Ireland.

¹⁶ Malone, Vol. II., pp. 58-69 (notes and references).

the parliamentary debates up to the time of Henry VIII.; and those who hold the contrary are actuated more by a desire to uphold the justice-loving character of that monarch than by the truth of historical facts. But more of this anon.

THE INTRODUCTION OF REFORMATION INTO IRELAND.

"Like as the King's Majesty justly and righteously is and ought to be the supreme Head of the Church in England; so in like manner the land of Ireland inasmuch as it is depending and belonging justly to the imperial crown of England."¹⁷ Such were the first words of the act of Parliament which proclaimed Henry VIII. of England Head of the Irish Church. The first intimation that the Irish Parliament received of this new doctrine was in 1534, when Henry suddenly discovered "that the abominable abuses and usurpations of the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction by his provisions and otherwise hath not onlie destroyed the Church in Ireland, but hath been the occasion of dissensions among the people."¹⁸ The deputy was ordered to "resist said Bishops provisions, the lyke to be passed there next Parliament." And thus the Reformation was ushered in.

The country was too disturbed in 1535 by the Rebellion of Silken Thomas for Parliament to devote its time to the King's religious intentions. Henry was growing impatient of the law's delay, and sharply reminded the Irish Parliament that whereas "he hath now made a new conquest of Ireland (forsooth, by the conquest of the Kildare family), to his great charge and cost, he wished an act of Parliament to be devised there whereby he may have the lands of all persons, both spiritual and temporal."¹⁹ There was, after all, some little worldliness in Henry's zeal for the destruction of the Popish monasteries. In May, 1536, the Parliament sat to pass those measures dear to the heart of the King. From the outset the procurators of the clergy "*were obstinate and did somewhat stick in divers of these acts; and lothe they are that the King's Grace shuld be the supreme Head of the Church.*"²⁰

In 1535 an ex-Augustinian friar named Browne—one of Henry's right-hand men in England—"a man of cheerful countenance; in his acts and deeds plain down right," had been appointed by Henry to the vacant Archbishopric of Dublin. The people, high and low, did not take kindly to the new doctrines which he proclaimed. His mission to these people, he tells us, was "fraught with danger to his life." The Archbishop of Armagh did not want Browne's reformation nor Henry to be Head of the Church. "The Archbishop of

¹⁷ Quotation from Acts 28 Henry VIII., cap. 5.

¹⁸ Irish State Papers, Vol. II., p. 215.

¹⁹ Carew Mss. (1515—), p. 68.

²⁰ Irish State Papers, Vol. II., p. 316.

Armagh hath been the chief oppugner," so wrote Browne. This Archbishop united his clergy to oppose the new doctrines and despatched messengers at once to Rome. "As for the common people, they were more zealous in their blunders than were the saints and martyrs in the truth at the beginning of the Gospel." Browne's first efforts in introducing the "reformed" religion were *not* a success. At the opening of Parliament in 1536 Browne's speech "*startled* the other Bishops and peers," and created such a sensation in the house that it was with great difficulty allowed "to go through." Brabazon, another creature of the King, seconded him. Evidently the members were not yet prepared for such novel doctrines as the following: That Henry was spiritual Head of the Church. "Behold," he began, "your obedience to your King is the observing of your God and of Christ, for He paid tribute to Cæsar." Then, by specious arguments, how the early Popes obeyed the Emperors. Browne declared that it was a shame for the Pope not to obey Henry, and that he (Browne) himself "without scruple voted Henry his superior in ecclesiastical affairs, and that no one was a true subject unless this decree of supremacy be approved."²¹ The spiritualitie in the Upper House "were willing to grant Henry at first the twentieth part of every man's revenues and rent for ten years," but there was no mention of supremacy.²² "All the sticking was in the Common house by seduction of certain proscribed." These were the followers of the Kildare family in the Lower House who urged on the others to resist the King's demands. The Commons were opposed to the King's supremacy; and we find even a crown official and another follower of Kildare being sent to England because they held "froward opinions." "One Patrick Barnewell, who was the King's sergeant, said openly in the Common House that he would not grant that the King as Head of the Church had so large power as the Bishop of Rome—his power extending only to reform abuses but not to execute manes laws, ne to dissolve abbeys, or to alterate the function of them to any temporal abuse."²³ These words show that Henry's position and actions were clearly understood in the Lower House at least. The Parliament continued into 1537, and still no acts of the King's supremacy were passed. There were rumors of Fitzgerald's return abroad in the February of this year, "which astonished the Commons; and the spiritualitie hath taken such an audacity as they litel agree to pass anything." The Viceroy Grey's reports were gloomy reading for his King.²⁴ The "spiritualitie" were the great obstacle to the passing of the act of supremacy.

²¹ Ware's "Antiquities." "Life of Browne," pp. 148, 149.

²² State Papers, Vol. II., p. 371.

²³ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 370.

²⁴ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 404.

The proctors were thereupon deprived of their right of voting in the assembly. When the Bishops in the Upper House saw this "move" of the viceroy they absolutely refused to debate till the question was decided about the proctors' right of voting; and accordingly they now opposed the bill of the twentieth part and other bills which were passed in the Common House. "Whereupon," writes Grey to Cromwell, "considering their obstinacy, Parliament was prorogued and a remedy provided against them in next session. It is a crafty cast between themselves and the Bishops."²⁵ The King's party in the Parliament—for there were now two camps—seem to have felt the illegality of depriving the proctors of their votes; but they had recourse to stratagem to carry their measure.²⁶ Even the wording of the act depriving the clergy of their rights shows that their action was unconstitutional and contrary to tradition. "For as much as at every Parliament begun and holden in this land, two proctors of every diocese in Ireland were accustomed to be summoned to Parliament, it was decreed that proctors have no right to vote."²⁷ After the removal of the proctors there was no further difficulty in the passing of the act of supremacy. The Bishops were outvoted in the Upper House and the government had so arranged matters that there was "no opposition." There was a Privy Council which managed things somewhat like the Star Chamber in England.²⁸ The Commons who were summoned were only from the neighborhood of the Pale.²⁹ After a year and a half the act of supremacy was passed in Ireland; the Reformation was declared "open." All the acts similar to those in England were "rushed through," for there was "no opposition" now. Acts declaring Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn valid, acts of first fruits, acts forbidding "provisions" and "bulls" from Rome, acts against Papal taxes, etc. It was declared high treason to refuse to take the oath of supremacy.³⁰ Mostly all, however, were aimed against the power of the Pope. Acts had been passed in Ireland previous to Henry's time against Peter's pence.³¹ The only new enactments were the King's supremacy and the suppression of the monasteries. The latter increased Henry's revenue by many thousands, but such an item would not appeal to such a religious reformer. He kept a good side out, but he knew his own mind. But it is necessary to go back to the year 1534.

²⁵ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 434.

²⁶ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 534; "Rothe Analecta," p. 267; also on power of proctors—"qui representant corpus totius cleri."

²⁷ Irish Statutes (Vesey), p. 103.

²⁸ Mason's "Irish Parliament," p. 34.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁰ Irish Statutes (Vesey), p. 90.

³¹ Robbins' Abridgement, p. 487; Carew Bk. of Howth, p. 453; 40 Edw. IV. (28-32 Henry VI.); 16 Edw. IV.

THE REFORMATION—ITS RECEPTION BY NOBLES AND PEOPLE.

The Earl of Kildare, the father of Silken Thomas, had been called over to England to answer some charges made against him by the Butlers and his enemies in the Irish Parliament. Kildare was not long abroad when the enemies of his house spread reports of his death. His son Thomas—called Silken Thomas on account of his dress—vain, hot-headed and enthusiastic, swallowed the lie, rushed to the council chamber, resigned his sword of state and declared himself an enemy of the King's, and in a speech said among other hard things that "Henry should be a byword for his heresy, lechery and tyranny."³² Archbishop Cromer, of Armagh, used all his influence in vain against his hasty rebellion. Letters were sent to the Pope and Charles V. of Germany, asking for their assistance "in wresting this island from a schismatic King."³³ Unfortunately for Silken Thomas' cause, Archbishop Alen, of Dublin, was murdered by a few of his soldiers, and he himself, among others, was excommunicated. He laid waste the country around Dublin and marched into Ossory, Butler's country; but, fearing a fight with the latter's forces, he suggested a compromise—namely, that they should divide Ireland between them. Butler sent back a contemptuous reply which nettled Silken Thomas, who proceeded at once to O'Neill for aid.³⁴ Kildare held out till the end of 1535, when he was deserted by O'Neill and the other northern chiefs, who grew afraid of the newly-appointed commander of the army, Lord Grey.³⁵ The unfortunate Silken Thomas ended his life on Tyburn in 1537, and his five uncles were treacherously arrested and put to death. The rebellion spread to the south and was kept in flame by James, Earl of Desmond, who was finally defeated by Grey. The latter, however, was connected with the Kildare family by marriage and consequently did not wish to push his victories too far in crushing those who had befriended Silken Thomas. Butler—the old enemy of the Kildares—obtained a large portion of their confiscated property by grant; so Grey sent his troops to waste Ossory's territory, for which he was charged afterwards. Butler was a loyalist in his day. The Irish chiefs—Con O'Neill, O'Brien and O'Connor—seeing the turn of events, made peace in July, 1535. Ireland became of great political importance by this rebellion, for it could be used as a strong ally against the English. There were reports of help from France and Scotland, so that Henry grew afraid for his Irish estate. One effect of this rebellion on the Reformation was that it brought into prominence

³² Campion Hist., p. 176.

³³ "Rothe Analecta," p. 267; Carew, p. 65; State Papers, p. 243.

³⁴ Carte Ormond, Introduction xc., etc.

³⁵ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 243.

before the Irish people, who loved the Kildare family, Henry's new position as a tyrant and a heretic. It was the followers of Silken Thomas who led the opposition to his supremacy in the Common House.

The Earl of Ossory was the first of the Irish—Anglo-Irish—nobles to renounce the supremacy of the Pope. This Butler was looked upon as "a black sheep" by the other chieftains, for he proved himself a mere sycophant of the King; his interests were identified with those of England.³⁶ As early as May, 1534, even before the Irish Parliament had been notified of the King's intention of making himself Pope, Butler had written to Henry his full belief in his supremacy. In his indentures to Henry he wrote: "The Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction and provisions have been the chief cause of the desolation of this land;" that it was "on account of the Pope that churches, monasteries have been in utter ruin and destroyed—appointing murderers, thieves and others of detestable disposition." Butler knew the kind of letter that would please his royal master. The Irish chiefs were not long at peace. Henry wanted the surrender of young Gerald Fitzgerald, a boy of twelve years, but the Irish refused to give him up. O'Neill and O'Donel in the north, the chiefs of Connaught, O'Brien and Desmond in the south—all joined in a league to defend the young lad.³⁷ "The inhabitants of the county of Kildare were the principal offenders in this rebellion," according to the state papers.³⁸ The young Fitzgerald escaped to Rome; peace was again made; the usual promises were handed in by some of the chieftains. Manus O'Donnell professed friendship to Grey, but in his letter stated that "he did not wish to act against God's law and Holy Church," which shows that he understood the turn things were taking. This was in 1537. There was no progress made yet in the "reforming" direction. In the same year Alen the Commissioner, writing on the state of Ireland, said: "Irishmen hath supposed the legal estate of this land to consist in the Bishop of Rome for the time being, and the lordship of the Kings of England to be but a governance under same, which causeth them to have more respect to the Bishop of Rome than Henry."³⁹ He suggested that the oath of supremacy be put into execution, "for as yet the *said oath is not put into execution.*" Henry was growing impatient for the revenues of the abbeys, and Grey set about "reforming" at once. In 1537 he robbed the abbey of Kyllagh, in Offaly (belonging to the Observant Friars), "of two organs and other necessary things for the King's College of Maynooth, and as much glass as glazed

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 440.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 467.

³⁸ Carew, p. 115.

³⁹ State Papers, p. 480.

part of windows of said college and part of windows of the King's castle at Maynooth."⁴⁰ This abbey was situated among "the wilde Irish," and religion does not seem to be in decay there.⁴¹ One Mac GilliPatrick, who lived near the Pale, was the first native Irish chief to renounce the Papacy. Soon after James of Desmond, when hard pressed by the King's forces, promised to "clerely relinquish the false and usurped power and authority of the Bishop of Rome."⁴²

The Reformation had made no progress since Browne preached his first sermon in 1536, "setting forth the word of God." There was nothing gained for his cause; on the contrary, he met with open opposition from priests and people, and the Irish chieftains had given a religious coloring to their actions in helping the Fitzgeralds. Browne himself was a reformer in the continental sense. Henry only claimed in the beginning supremacy of the Church while maintaining its doctrines. Browne himself received a sharp reproof from Henry "for his lightness in behavior and the elation of his mind in pride," and advised him "to reforme himself and to do his duty in preaching and in the advancement of the King's state."⁴³ This letter "made him trymble in body." It was dangerous to be near the throne.

In January, 1538, Browne wrote: "Neither by gentill exhortation, evangelical instruction nor by oathes of them taken solemnly can I perswade any, either religious or secular, since my coming over to preache the worde of God or the just title of our prince. They *preach in corners and such company as they can trust and so motche as in them lyeth, hindereth and ploketh back among the people the labour that I do.* They little regard myn auctoritie and the observaunts be the worste of all others."⁴⁴ Grey he considered as his enemy also in this matter, for the Deputy, though he robbed monasteries, was not prepared for Browne's Reformation doctrines. Browne, in despair, asked for "a straitte commandment over all ecclesiastical parsons," as there was "never an Archbishop ne Bishop but myself made by the King but he is repelled even now by provision from Rome." He suggested that a Master of Faculties be set up (sic) and "dispensacions" be granted by the new Pope—Henry; for "many of the Irish availed themselves of the Pope's indulgence lately sent to Ireland, and in all things these men were always ready to admit the Bishop of Rome's letters and were sturdy against Henry's power."⁴⁵

⁴⁰ State Papers, pp. 512 and 534.

⁴¹ McFirlis Annals ad an 1451.

⁴² State Papers, p. 537.

⁴³ State Papers, p. 465.

⁴⁴ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 539.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

The Pope sent a reply to Archbishop Cromer's letter encouraging the Irish to resist the new doctrines, and a letter was also sent to O'Neill to stir him up in the cause of religion. The war, which was begun in aid of young Gerald Fitzgerald, now took on the aspect of a religious uprising. The clergy of the north urged on the Irish princes to unite.⁴⁶ In Dublin several incumbents resigned rather than yield. Even amongst the government party there were only a few anxious for the Reformation as Browne preached it. They were prepared to swear that Henry was spiritual Head of the Church, but they did not understand nor want the continental change in religion. Henry was always a Catholic at heart. We find Staples, who was appointed to Meath by Henry, charging Browne with having "an abhorrence of the Mass" and introducing new tenets in his "Form of the Beads." He called Browne "a heretic and a beggar" and other things "that every honest ear glowed to hear."⁴⁷

This "Form of the Beads" was a prayer drawn up by Browne to be recited in the churches. It was the thin end of the wedge, and what with Staples, who called him a heretic, and Grey, who was a Catholic, he had to be careful in his preaching. The prayer was cleverly worded. It began with a petition for the Universal Catholic Church and for Henry, its supreme Head. The person reciting the prayer was to understand that "the Bishop of Rome's authority was lawfully by act of Parliament and by the consent of the Oxford bishops extinct," and that the Pope's name should be erased from their books, and they were to say a Pater Noster and Ave for the various intentions. (Note the Ave!) There were disturbances in the churches—especially in St. Patrick's, Dublin—over this form. Priest refused to read it.⁴⁸ Browne imprisoned the prebend of St. Patrick's, but Grey set him at liberty.⁴⁹ In the spring of 1538 public feeling was growing stronger day by day against the King's supremacy. "*The Papistical sect spreading; general recourse daily to Rome by religious men of the Irish nacion and papysticalls never so much as at present; the Observauntes worse than all others in stirring up the people; the common voice is that the King's supremacy is maintained by power and not reasoned by learning*"—such were the despatches to England.⁵⁰

There was continual dissension between Grey and the Council. He was accused of "favoring the Irish and his friends the Kildare secte; that he did not press his opportunities against them; that no man durst speak against the Bishop of Rome's authority of whose

⁴⁶ Leland, Vol. II., pp. 170-172; "Hibernia Dominicana."

⁴⁷ State Papers, Vol. II., p. 569; and Vol. III., p. 1.

⁴⁸ Carew, p. 141; and State Papers, Vol. II., p. 563; Vol. III., p. 6.

⁴⁹ State Papers, Vol. III., p. 8.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, p. 9.

secte he is the chief principal in this land.”⁵¹ He was not advanced enough in his religious opinions for Butler and Browne, but certainly in public he maintained the supremacy of Henry. In July of 1538 he went on an expedition through the south of Ireland, and in clear terms O’Carrol, Clanricarde, James of Desmond, Uleck Burke, O’Brien “renounced the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome.”⁵² How far such a renunciation, wrung from the chiefs by the presence of a large army, was sincere must be left to the reader. The Deputy passed on to Limerick with a large retinue, intending thereby to impress the natives with a sense of England’s strength. The chiefs around Limerick also “renounced”—whatever that may mean in the official documents—the Papal supremacy; and, furthermore, adds Grey: “I called before me the Bishop of Limerick and had him sworn in lykwyse.” Thence he marched for Galway and “there the Mayor and Bishop of Galway swore as at Limerick.” (Was there a Bishop of Galway at that time?)⁵³ O’Conor of Connaught earned doubtful praise “for his faithfulness and for renouncing the Bishop of Rome.” On this march of the Deputy they sacked monasteries as they went, and so ruthless were the English soldiers in their destruction “of idols and images *that the King commanded that images bet set up again and worshipped as much as ever.*”⁵⁴

This incident shows that Henry did not intend to be a reformer in the sense in which Protestants claim. Browne had only a small following in the Council. A bishop and a friar were arrested and Browne wanted to have them imprisoned, yet he adds complainingly: “Yet our masters of the law and all others (*except very few beside*) are such papistes, ypocrites and worshippers of idols that they (Bishop and friar) were not indited;” and the reforming party were “afraid to go into the chapel lest they might *occasion the people*. Notwithstanding My Lord Deputy very devoutly kneeling before the statue of our Lady of Trim heard 3 or 4 masses.”⁵⁵ The Reformation had not progressed beyond Browne’s circle of friends. In December of 1538 he went on an expedition with the army, “not onlie for the publishing of the King’s injunctions, setting forth the word of God and plucking down the Bishop of Rome’s authority, but also as well for levieng of the first fruits and twentieth part with other revenues.” They went to Lord Butler, who entertained them for the Christmas.⁵⁶ This “army of the Lord,” as some would call it, next proceeded to Kilkenny, where they published the Articles of

⁵¹ State Papers, Vol. III., p. 34.

⁵² State Papers, Vol. III., p. 57.

⁵³ State Papers, Vol. III., p. 59; Carew MSS., p. 146.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

Faith and the King's translation of the "Pater Noster." Then on the evangelizing army went towards Ross and Waterford. At Wexford "some malefactors were executed;" at Waterford "four felons with another thief were hanged—the latter in his habit and so to remain upon the gallows for a mirror to all other his bredern to live trulie." Gerald MacShane, a chief of Waterford, refused to pay taxes or deny the Pope's supremacy. There was a "sessions" called in the city by the Deputy, but there were only a few people present. The next halting place was at Clonmel, where, according to the Council, who seemed to have been "drawing the long bow," for the facts, as will be shown, cannot fit in with their statement, two Archbishops and eight Bishops took the oath of supremacy. Several Irish bishops did take the oath of the King's supremacy, but it cannot have been at Clonmel; and only four "southern" bishops can be proved to have taken the oath. But the Council wanted to report good news to the King, and what matter a few bishops more or less!

The year 1539 did not open very favorably for the government, notwithstanding Browne's triumphal march. The northern chiefs, under O'Neill and O'Donel, had joined forces and intended to go south to join James FitzMaurice, Earl of Desmond, the leader of the southern clans. They marched into Meath and ravaged the country. The Annals write: "They seized an immense booty, and on return of their forces there was exultation, boasting, vain glory." Grey fell upon the disorganized troops at Belahoa, inflicted a crushing defeat on the Irish, and so destroyed all chance of their union with the southern forces. This confederacy of the Irish chieftains struck terror into the English Council, as it had the approval of the Pope and there were rumors of help from Scotland. Even the government were not certain of having the dwellers in the Pale on their side, for the Geraldines had a strong following there. "Whate for the favour many of them bore to the Geraldines and the favour many of them bore the Church of Rome," no wonder there was uneasiness in the English Council. O'Neill had notions of the Kingship of Ireland; the Irish nobles were rallying round his standard. James of Desmond "began the daunce" and attacked the English allies, Ormond and Butler; the other southern chiefs were up in arms. But the Deputy—Grey—who at all events was a good soldier, soon outwitted the Irish forces; he repulsed with great loss Desmond and O'Brien. The remaining chieftains grew afraid, and on this expedition he made no less than twenty treaties with those petty lords. A yearly tax was imposed, but there was no mention made of the King's supremacy. It would not have been wise, for, as the state papers say, "the cause of this treacherous conspiracy,

as they openly declare, is that the King's Highness is a heretic against the Faith."⁵⁷ "Their followers called all Englishmen heretics."

The war was carried on in a desultory manner in the north after the submission of the southern chieftains. The "rebels" were still troublesome, notwithstanding the treaties, and they still persisted in their purpose against the King's supremacy and in helping the Geraldines.⁵⁸ In March of 1540 young Gerald escaped to the Continent. O'Neill, after much hesitation, sent in his resignation in June, made a very humble apology and acknowledged Henry as supreme Head of the Church.⁵⁹ This action of O'Neill induced the minor chiefs to do likewise, and soon after "resignations" and renunciations of the Pope's authority came in from these princes of the people—O'More and O'Connor of Connaught, the Kavanaghs, the O'Tooles, the Byrnes. Grey, who had been summoned to England to answer charges put forward by his enemies in the Council, was accused of high treason to his King on the following grounds: "That he left all the King's artillery in Ireland in Galway, *which was and is more redie there for the Bishop of Rome* or Spaniards than the King; that he delivered out of Dublin Castle the Dean of Derry and Bishop of Enactuensis taken on high treason; that he favoured the Geraldines and Papists."⁶⁰ And the last charge brought against him seems strange—namely, that "he burned the church of Down Patrick and was guilty of many other sacrilegious actions." His accusers, who plundered monasteries for Henry, saw no inconsistency in charging Grey with "sacrilege." He was executed in 1541; and thus he was rewarded for his services to the new Pope of England.

Brereton replaced Grey, who was in turn succeeded by Sir Anthony St. Leger. This Deputy intended to govern Ireland rather by quiet intrigue than by the threat of arms. His policy was to keep the Irish at variance among themselves, and that the weaker party should be under the protection of the government. A spirit of distrust of themselves had crept up among the Irish chiefs. Each one made war on his own account, for they had no common bond of country; each sought only the glory of his clan. Thus we find in the Annals of the Four Masters—who wrote under correction of the O'Donnells, in whose territory their monastery was situated—this significant statement in praise of Hugh O'Donnell, who died in 1537: "A man who did not suffer the power of England to come into the country, for he formed a league of friendship with the King of England when the Irish would not yield superiority to any among

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 143, 169; Carew MSS., p. 155.

⁵⁸ Vol. III., pp. 175, 182.

⁵⁹ Vol. III., pp. 207, 217.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 249; Carew MSS., p. 166; and Annals ad an 1538.

themselves." Surely the Annalists went "in a round about way" to praise their patron; but the essential fact was that mutual jealousy prevented anything like united action against their common foe. They had grown tired of petty wars, and there was a rush of "resignations," and with the resignations also the denial of Papal supremacy. All the great chiefs took the oath. Desmond, McWilliam of Connaught, O'Donnell had sent in their peace indentures early in 1541.⁶¹ In June, 1541, Parliament was called by St. Leger and the title "King of Ireland" was bestowed on Henry VIII. Previous to this the English sovereigns were only "lords of Ireland." There were present at the passing of this act Desmond and many lords—not chieftains, for they adopted the English titles—of Munster; McWilliam from Connaught, now Earl of Clanrickarde, and O'Brien of Thomond. "It was joyfully and three times read; and it passed the Lower House with no less joy"—so say the state papers. This was the first public act of the Irish chieftains which marked the downward way. Instead of defending their country against an encroaching enemy, there was a scramble for government titles and for government favor. There was feasting and rejoicing in Dublin; "Te Deums" were sung, and Henry was pleased with his Irish subjects. True, O'Neill was "in rebellion" at this time; but towards the end of 1541 he, too, sent in his submission. This chapter in Irish history does not add to the glory of the grand names of old. But there was murmuring and discontent among the people at the action of their leaders, and the enthusiasm was not felt beyond Dublin.⁶²

This Parliament was prorogued at intervals, but lasted for two years and five months. The government did not press the question of the King's supremacy and were content with passing acts which would better secure the peace of the country, the spread of British rule in the island and the increase in the King's revenue. Acts were passed against Papal authority, and all monasteries were declared to be the property of the King. For the Irish in Munster and Connaught, who practically ignored the fact that there was an English Parliament in Dublin, a modified code of laws were drawn up; and it was prudently decided that the only fact to be put forward in those districts was that Henry was King of Ireland; the supremacy was not to be mentioned. At this Parliament there were several bishops who, of course, subscribed ipso facto to the King's spiritual supremacy, for the wording of the acts was clear. It was decided that all Archbishops and Bishops be permitted to use their jurisdiction in every diocese through the land. They were appointed to

⁶¹ *Annals* ad 1537.

⁶² Carew, p. 174.

be the judges in all cases of dispute—the cases to be decided according to English, not Irish, law. Some of them were appointed crown arbitrators to lay down the law “according to the English method”—this was the essential point.⁶³

By the end of 1541 all the Irish chiefs had submitted to the new code. They promised to lay aside their language and customs and to adopt the English ways. “It grew fashionable to affect a zeal for the government.”⁶⁴ O'Neill went to the English court with his chaplain and was created Earl. Henry knew how to play the patron, and with the title he often made gifts of the abbeys and lands to these degenerate lords.⁶⁵

It was a strange thing to see Manus O'Donnell of Tyrone, the founder of the monastery of Donegal, sending his son to be “trained” in the English court, craving a title from an apostate King and swearing that he, as far as in him lay, would destroy the power of Rome among his people.⁶⁶ Later on, in 1543, this same Manus asked Henry to appoint his chaplain to the vacant See of Elphin.⁶⁷ O'Reilly, “chief captain of his nation” as he loved to call himself, was a suppliant to Henry for “a lytell ferym.” Murough O'Brien was created Earl of Thomond; Burke, Earl of Clanrickarde. There is not much more to relate about the Irish chiefs. They had mutual squabbles, and they went to the English Deputy to settle the differences between them. During the remaining years there were reports of a French invasion of Ireland, as Henry and Francis I. of France were at war. But the Irish chiefs were too dispirited to respond and preferred to remain at peace under the protecting shadow of England. So low had they sunk in national spirit that they came together to send “a testimonial” to Henry on Sentleger's great capabilities to rule Ireland. The opening of the address was as follows: “We who were formerly styled Irishmen, testify that we acknowledge no other King or Master on earth save Your Highness.” And all this from the princes of the people! A few minor chieftains broke through their agreements—O'Connor of Offaly and O'More—but the Deputy marched against them, ravaged their country and sacked all the monasteries in their territories. There were frequent rumors of a French and Scotch invasion. Strange vessels were seen off the Irish coast, and the government was disturbed. Its policy was to hold the Irish chiefs in touch with the King, and consequently it did not urge very strongly in the latter years of his

⁶³ Cox, p. 270.

⁶⁴ Ware, “*Antiq. Annals*,” p. 104; Cox, p. 268; Carew, p. 180; *State Papers*, p. 308.

⁶⁵ *State Papers*, pp. 349, 320.

⁶⁶ Ware, p. 104.

⁶⁷ *State Papers*, pp. 312, 362; Carew, p. 183.

reign the principle of his supremacy, as it would prove obnoxious to the people.

Many seek to excuse the action of the Irish chiefs in this matter; but they must stand condemned by the facts of history of having shamelessly abandoned their country and religious principles, at a time, too, when their united action could have easily driven the Saxon from their shores. Some put their action down to ignorance of the real issues at stake, but this view cannot hold. The people knew what was wanted of them, for were not "all Englishmen heretics in their eyes." At the first introduction of the measure into Parliament there was open opposition in both houses, and the Observaunt Friars openly preached against the King's supremacy. The rebellion of 1539 was partly religious, partly political. Were there not letters sent to Rome by the Irish people and priests? And was not Con O'Neill styled "a champion for the honour of God and the Church of Rome" by Pope Paul III. in the very year in which he openly renounced Papal infallibility and all Popish tendencies?⁶⁸ Did not some of the chieftains explain to Henry that it was through ignorance they had not embraced his doctrines sooner? And yet, despite these facts, there are some who say that they confused the temporal and spiritual power of the Pope, and while yielding on the former, they did not renounce the latter. True, there was some confusion of the two notions, and we find that even Henry urged among his titles to the Kingship of Ireland the fact that "his ancestors got a grant of it from the Pope's predecessors." But the struggle had been made clear to the chieftains, and it does not require much theology to see that a man like Henry claiming supreme authority under Christ thereby destroyed the fundamental principle of the Church. It was neither ignorance nor loyalty that urged them on; but when circumstances looked black against them they did not hesitate to sacrifice great principle for a tyrant's favor. How far their actions were the result of fear cannot be known, and surely fear—there was no great reason for it then—could not justify their conduct. They gave the lie direct to their past by proclaiming Henry King of Ireland and Head of the Church. We see them barter all they were professedly fighting for, which would make one agree with Cox, who describes them thus: "The Irish potentates began generally to own themselves champions of the Papacy and Liberty in order to clothe their designs of robbery and plunder."⁶⁹ The majority of these petty lords were reduced to a state of poverty. Even the great Desmond, who corresponded with the Emperor Charles V., was reduced to hard straits. He was "surprised" at

⁶⁸ State Papers, p. 471.

⁶⁹ "Hibernia Dominicana," p. 106.

home one day by some visitors, who found him "very rude in gesture and apparel, having for want of nurture as much good manners as his kerns and followers could teach him."⁷⁰ The spoliation of the monasteries must have been a veritable God-send to those broken-down lords; for "their occupation was gone," and they would probably have sworn that Henry was an angel without wings if he had asked them. Religion seems never to have troubled them during life, but when the hey-day of the blood was tame they entered a monastery and the Annalists love to tell how the chief died in a Franciscan habit. Even on the supposition that the submissions of the Irish chieftains were insincere, as after events would go to show, still great national or Catholic principles should always be upheld before the face of the world. The chain of gold which O'Neill received from the King was a symbol of the slavery in which the Irish chiefs were held; for a petty favor, a title, from Henry they sold their birthright of faith and country.

But the people showed opposition to the action of their chiefs; for, when they went after having signed all that Henry wanted them to sign, they found their clansmen in rebellion. There were open hostilities among the Burkes of Connaught over the election of a chief, for a strong party was in arms against the son of the lately created Earl.⁷¹ O'Donnell's people were also in revolt, and in order to quell the revolt one of the O'Donnells "brought English captains with them into Tyrconnell." It was the same story of discontent at the action of their leaders among the O'Rorkes, the Maguires and O'Briens. The Annals are suspiciously silent over the conduct of the chieftains; they give us, moreover, no insight into the workings of Irish life, and there is not a word of the chieftains yielding to Henry on the question of his Kingship or supremacy. The people were firm against the Reformation doctrines, or, rather, against Henry's spiritual supremacy; for the Reformation as we know it now was not preached in Henry's time. And, somehow or other, heresy never seemed to have the power of catching on in Ireland. Previous to Henry's time some heresies were started, but they made no progress; they were isolated efforts and mostly always came from the English clergy.⁷² One Henry Crump taught the novel doctrine that "Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar was only a glass through which the body of Christ in heaven was seen."⁷³ Others put forward occasionally theories against the divinity of Christ and the chastity of the Blessed Virgin, but the failure of these cases only serves to show more clearly the tenacity of the Irish to the old faith.

⁷⁰ Cox, p. 261.

⁷¹ Hooker, "Chronicles of Ireland," p. 106.

⁷² Annals ad 1543-1544; Donovan, p. 1,479.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 1,495.

The Irish people were "cribbed, cabined, confined" within the cast-iron laws of the clan system—a system which, if it deprived the individual of all initiative, was also a protection against innovations from without. It was the clan which resolved and acted. Conservative of old rights and customs—with their bards to sing of the glories of days gone by, with their ollaves to weave the achievements of the clan into heroic tales, and their monks who were identified with all their sorrows and triumphs—the people were too much bound up with their past to break up all traditions at once at the command of an English King. In temporals, they acknowledged only their chief; in spirituals, the Pope was their spiritual ruler. Beyond these two facts the mass of the people could not see. And it must have been the greatest joke imaginable to the Irish to hear that Henry of England—the man of many wives—actually claimed to be the supreme ruler of the Church.

The Irish people were not "educated" up to that point that they could understand what the Reformation meant or the other questions that were troubling men's minds on the Continent. Ireland at this time was an anachronism among the peoples in the sixteenth century. She was cut off from the movements abroad by her insular position, her political state, her internal constitutions, her conservatism, her language. While the continental or English tradesman was discussing in his tap-room the relations between Church and State, the Irish Celt was following his lord to battle or eking out a miserable existence in the wilds and fastnesses. There was none of the restlessness or kicking against the goad which was felt amongst the lower classes in England. Browne of Dublin had to confess that his efforts at reforming the Irish were a failure. The people were urged on by the Franciscan friars to resist all changes in religion; and, furthermore, their racial feelings prompted them to resist the foreigners in whatever measures they imposed. Even amongst the English settlers of the Pale sympathy was for the Catholic religion against Browne and his new tenets.⁷⁴ From the Dublin clergy—especially the chapter of St. Patrick's—Browne received determined opposition, and several clergymen, Englishmen, resigned rather than conform to the King's supremacy.⁷⁵ Irish was the language of the country which was spoken even within the Pale. We have seen that there was dissension among the Council even on the question of supremacy; and so Browne had to fight against fearful odds, and he dared not be too open in pushing forward the continental theories which he believed himself. Henry did not want these extreme changes, for he knew—good easy man—that these doctrines were

⁷⁴ Dalton's "History of Ireland," p. 424.

⁷⁵ Ware's Writers, Bk. I., p. 86.

opposed to the true religion. He was a keen theologian; but he wanted money, he wanted to revenge himself on the Pope, and under the cloak of a religious reformer he had himself elected Pope, and under his zeal for monastic reform he plundered the monasteries. Thus far did he go, and no farther. Even he was not overanxious to press his supremacy on the Irish people, if we are to judge from his policy after 1541.⁷⁶ The only persons who would be in favor of a change in religion were the usual place-hunters and hangers-on of the government. Those of the clergy of England who came over to preach "the true worde of God" were the offscourings of the English Church—men who had got into difficulties in their own country and whose morals would not attract many followers into the new Gospel.⁷⁷ Killeen, the Protestant historian, writes that in Henry's time "there was no intelligent professor of the reformed faith in Ulster, Connaught, Munster"—probably Browne would constitute the intelligence of Leinster.⁷⁸ "There was only one sermon made in the country for three years, and that by the Bishop of Meath (Staples)," writes a contemporary.⁷⁹ "Preaching we have none, without which the ignorant cannot have knowledge," writes another.⁸⁰ The change in ritual was not recognized.⁸¹ There was plenty of blowing of trumpets on paper; acts of Parliament were passed; copies of the "Form of the Beads" and translations of the Lord's prayer were made in English for people who spoke only Irish; but let it be clearly understood that there was no "reformation" in Ireland in Henry's time, and the mass of the people were no more affected by these measures than the inhabitants of Timbuctoo. Browne wrote in 1545 his last letter to Henry: "Assuring your Majesty I think they be weary of us all that be Englishmen here."⁸² And a Protestant historian has summed up the case when he wrote regarding the Reformation: "It may scarcely be said to have taken place at all beyond the limits of the parchment on which it was enacted."⁸³

JOHN HENEGHAN.

Maynooth, Ireland.

⁷⁶ State Papers, Vol. III., pp. 111, 117, 137.

⁷⁷ Mant; Leland, Vol. II., p. 170.

⁷⁸ Cox, p. 275; Marrin Rolls, pp. 97, 103.

⁷⁹ Brewer Carew MSS., pp. xvii., xxiv.

⁸⁰ Killeen Hist., Vol. I., p. 353.

⁸¹ Leland, Vol. II., p. 193.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Killeen, p. 353.

⁸⁴ State Papers, Vol. III., p. 557.

⁸⁵ "Liber Munerum," Vol. I., p. 34.

DECRETUM DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO.

IUSSU ET AUCTORITATE SS. D. N. PII PAPAE X. A S. CONGREGATIONE
CONCILII EDITUM.

NE TEMERE inirentur clandestina coniugia, quae Dei Ecclesia iustissimis de causis semper detestata est atque prohibuit, provide cavit Tridentinum Concilium, Cap. I., Sess. XXIV. de reform. matrim. edicens: "Qui aliter quam praesente parochi vel alio sacerdote de ipsius parochi seu Ordinarii licentia et duobus vel tribus testibus matrimonium contrahere attentabunt, eos Sancta Synodus ad sic contrahendum omnino inhabiles reddit, et huiusmodi contractus irritos et nullos esse decernit."

Sed cum idem Sacrum Concilium praecepisset, ut tale decretum publicaretur in singulis parocciis, nec vim haberet nisi iis in locis ubi esset promulgatum; accidit ut plura loca, in quibus publicatio illa facta non fuit, beneficio tridentinae legis caruerint, hodieque careant, et haesitationibus atque incommodis veteris disciplinae adhuc obnoxia maneant.

Verum nec ubi viguit nova lex, sublata est omnis difficultas. Saepe namque gravis exstitit dubitatio in decernenda persona parochi, quo praesente matrimonium sit contrahendum. Statuit quidem canonica disciplina, proprium parochum eum intelligi debere, cuius in parocia domicilium sit, aut quasi domicilium alterutrius contrahentis. Verum quia nonnunquam difficile est iudicare, certo ne constet de quasi-domicilio, haud pauca matrimonia fuerunt obiecta periculo ne nulla essent: multa quoque, sive inscitia hominum sive fraude, illegitima prorsus atque irrita deprehensa sunt.

Haec dudum deplorata, eo crebrius accidere nostra aetate videmus, quo facilius ac celerius commeatus cum gentibus, etiam disiunctissimis, perficiuntur. Quamobrem sapientibus viris ac doctissimis visum est expedire ut mutatio aliqua induceretur in iure circa formam celebrandi connubii. Complures etiam sacrorum Antistites omni ex parte terrarum, praesertim e celebrioribus civitatibus, ubi gravior appareret necessitas, supplices ad id preces Apostolicae Sedi admoverunt.

Flagitatum simul est ab Episcopis, tum Europae plerisque, tum aliarum regionum, ut incommodis occurreretur, quae ex sponsalibus, idest mutuis promissionibus futuri matrimonii privatim initis, derivantur. Docuit enim experientia satis, quae secum pericula ferant eiusmodi sponsalia: primum quidem incitamenta peccandi causamque cur inexpertae puellae decipiantur; postea dissidia ac lites inextricabiles.

His rerum adiunctis permotus SS^{mus} D. N. Pius PP. X. pro ea quam gerit omnium Ecclesiarum sollicitudine, cupiens ad memorata damna et pericula removenda temperatione aliqua uti, commisit S. Congregationi Concilii ut de hac re videret, et quae opportuna aestimaret, Sibi proponeret.

Voluit etiam votum audire Consilii ad ius canonicum in unum redigendum constituti, nec non Eminentiorum Cardinalium qui pro eodem codice parando speciali commissione delecti sunt: a quibus, quemadmodum et a S. Congregatione Concilii, conventus in eum finem saepius habiti sunt. Omnium autem sententiis obtentis SS^{mus} Dominus S. Congregationi Concilii mandavit, ut decretum ederet quo leges a Se, ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione probatae, continerentur, quibus sponsalium et matrimonii disciplina in posterum regeretur, eorumque celebratio expedita, certa atque ordinata fieret.

In executionem itaque Apostolici mandati S. Concilii Congregatio praesentibus litteris constituit atque decernit ea quae sequuntur.

DE SPONSALIBUS.

I. Ea tantum sponsalia habentur valida et canonicos sortiuntur effectus, quae contracta fuerint per scripturam subsignatam a partibus et vel a paroco, aut a loci Ordinario, vel saltem a duobus testibus.

Quod si utraque vel alterutra pars scribere nesciat, id in ipsa scriptura adnotetur; et alius testis addatur, qui cum paroco, aut loci Ordinario, vel duobus testibus, de quibus supra, scripturam subsignet.

II. Nomine parochi hic et in sequentibus articulis venit non solum qui legitime praeest paroeciae canonice erectae; sed in regionibus, ubi paroecia canonice erectae non sunt, etiam sacerdos cui in aliquo definito territorio cura animarum legitime commissa est, et paroco aequiparatur; et in missionibus, ubi territoria necdum perfecte divisa sunt, omnis sacerdos a missionis Moderatore ad animarum curam in aliqua statione universaliter deputatus.

DE MATRIMONIO.

III. Ea tantum matrimonia valida sunt, quae contrahuntur coram paroco vel loci Ordinario vel sacerdote ab alterutro delegato, et duobus saltem testibus, iuxta tamen regulas in sequentibus articulis expressas, et salvis exceptionibus quae infra n. VII. et VIII. ponuntur.

IV. Parochus et loci Ordinarius valide matrimonio adstant:

1. Die tantummodo adeptae possessionis beneficii vel initi officii,

nisi publico decreto nominatim fuerint excommunicati vel ab officio suspensi.

2. Intra limites dumtaxat sui territorii: in quo matrimoniis nedum suorum subditorum, sed etiam non subditorum valide ad-sistunt.

3. Dummodo invitati ac rogati, et neque vi neque metu gravi constricti requirant excipiantque contrahentium consensum.

V. Licite autem ad-sistunt:

1. Constito sibi legitime de libero statu contrahentium, servatis de iure servandis.

2. Constito insuper de domicilio, vel saltem de menstrua com-moratione alterutrius contraentis in loco matrimonii.

3. Quod si deficiat, ut parochus et loci Ordinarius licite matri-monio adsint, indigent licentia parochi vel Ordinarii proprii alterutrius contrahentis, nisi gravis intercedat necessitas, quae ab ea excuset.

4. Quoad *vagos*, extra casum necessitatis parochus ne liceat eorum matrimoniis ad-sistere, nisi re ad Ordinarium vel ad sacerdotem ab eo delegatum delata, licentiam ad-sistendi impetraverit.

5. In quolibet autem casu pro regula habeatur, ut matrimonium coram sponsae parochus celebretur, nisi aliqua iusta causa excuset.

VI. Parochus et loci Ordinarius licentiam concedere possunt alio sacerdoti determinato ac certo, ut matrimoniis intra limites sui ter-ritorii ad-sistat.

Delegatus autem, ut valide et licite ad-sistat, servare tenetur limites mandati, et regulas pro parochus et loci Ordinario n. IV. et V. superius statutas.

VII. Imminente mortis periculo, ubi parochus, vel loci Ordinar-ius, vel sacerdos ab alterutro delegatus, haberi nequeat, ad con-sulendum conscientiae et (si casus ferat) legitimationi prolis, matrimonium contrahi valide ac licite potest coram quolibet sacerdote et duobus testibus.

VIII. Si contingat ut in aliqua regione parochus locive Ordinar-ius, aut sacerdos ab eis delegatus, coram quo matrimonium celebrari queat, haberi non possit, eaque rerum conditio a mense iam perseveret, matrimonium valide ac licite iniri potest emissio a sponsis formali consensu coram duobus testibus.

IX. 1. Celebrato matrimonio, parochus, vel qui eius vices gerit, statim describat in libro matrimoniorum nomina coniugum ac testium, locum et diem celebrati matrimonii, atque alia, iuxta modum in libris ritualibus vel a proprio Ordinario praescriptum; idque licet alius sacerdos vel a se vel ab Ordinario delegatus matrimonio adstiterit.

2. Praeterea parochus in libro quoque baptizatorum adnotet,

coniugem tali die in sua parochia matrimonium contraxisse. Quod si coniux alibi baptizatus fuerit, matrimonii parochus notitiam initi contractus ad parochum baptismi sive per se, sive per curiam episcopalem transmittat, ut matrimonium in baptismi libri referatur.

3. Quoties matrimonium ad normam n. VII. aut VIII. contrahitur, sacerdos in priori casu, testes in altero, tenentur in solidum cum contrahentibus curare, ut initum coniugium in praescriptis libris quam primum adnotetur.

X. Parochi qui haec hactenus praescripta violaverint, ab Ordinariis pro modo et gravitate culpae puniantur. Et insuper si alicuius matrimonio adstiterint contra praescriptum 2 et 3 n. V., emolumenta *stolae* sua ne faciant, sed proprio contrahentium parochi remittant.

XI. I. Statutis superius logibus tenentur omnes in catholica Ecclesia baptizati et ad eam ex haeresi aut schismate conversi (licet sive hi, sive illi ab eadem postea defecerint), quoties inter se sponsalia vel matrimonium ineant.

2. Vigent quoque pro iisdem de quibus supra catholicis, si cum acatholicis sive baptizatis, sive non baptizatis, etiam post obtentam dispensationem ab impedimento mixtae religionis vel disparitatis cultus, sponsalia vel matrimonium contrahunt; nisi pro aliquo particulari loco aut regione aliter a S. Sede sit statutum.

3. Acatholici sive baptizati sive non baptizati, si inter se contrahunt, nullibi ligantur ad catholicam sponsalium vel matrimonii formam servandam.

Praesens decretum legitime publicatum et promulgatum habeatur per eius transmissionem ad locorum Ordinarios: et quae in eo disposita sunt ubique vim legis habere incipiant a die solemni Paschae Resurrectionis D. N. I. C. proximi anni 1908.

Interim vero omnes locorum Ordinarii curent hoc decretum quamprimum in vulgus edi, et in singulis suarum dioecesium parochialibus ecclesiis explicari, ut ab omnibus rite cognoscatur.

Praesentibus valituris de mandato speciali SSmi D. N. Pii PP. X., contrariis quibuscumque etiam peculiari mentione dignis minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae die 2a mensis Augusti anni 1907.

✠ VINCENTIUS Card. Ep. Praenest., *Praefectus*.

C. DE LAI, *Secretarius*.

DECREE CONCERNING SPONSALIA AND MATRIMONY.

ISSUED BY THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL BY THE
ORDER AND WITH THE AUTHORITY OF OUR HOLY
FATHER POPE PIUS X.

THE Council of Trent, Cap. I., Sess. XXIV. de reform. matrim., made prudent provision against the rash celebration of clandestine marriages, which the Church of God for most just reasons has always detested and forbidden, by decreeing: "Those who otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest himself or of another priest acting with the license of the parish priest or of the Ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses, shall attempt to contract matrimony, the Holy Synod renders them altogether incapable of contracting marriage thus, and decrees that contracts of this kind are null and void."

But as the same Sacred Council prescribed that said decree should be published in all the parishes and was not to have force except in those places in which it had been promulgated, it has happened that many places in which the publication has not been made have been deprived of the benefit of the Tridentine law, and are still without it, and continue to be subject to the doubts and inconveniences of the old discipline.

Nor has all difficulty been removed in those places where the new law has been in force. For often there has been grave doubt in deciding as to the person of the parish priest before whom a marriage is to be celebrated. The canonical discipline did indeed decide that he is to be regarded as the parish priest in whose parish one or other of the contracting parties has his or her domicile or quasi-domicile. But as it is sometimes difficult to judge whether a quasi-domicile really exists in a specified case, not a few marriages were exposed to the danger of nullity; many, too, either owing to ignorance or fraud, have been found to be quite illegitimate and void.

These deplorable results have been seen to happen more frequently in our own time on account of the increased facility and celerity of intercommunication between the different countries, even those most widely separated. It has therefore seemed expedient to wise and learned men to introduce some change into the law regulating the form of the celebration of marriage, and a great many Bishops in all parts of the world, but especially in the more populous States where the necessity appears more urgent, have petitioned the Holy See to this end.

It has been asked also by very many Bishops in Europe, as well by others in various regions, that provision should be made to prevent the inconveniences arising from sponsalia, that is, mutual promises of marriage privately entered upon. For experience has sufficiently shown the many dangers of such sponsalia, first as being an incitement to sin and causing the deception of inexperienced girls, and afterwards giving rise to inextricable dissensions and disputes.

Influenced by these circumstances, our Holy Father Pope Pius X., desiring, in the solicitude he bears for all the churches, to introduce some modifications with the object of removing these drawbacks and dangers, committed to the S. Congregation of the Council the task of examining into the matter and of proposing to himself the measures it should deem opportune.

He was pleased also to have the opinion of the commission appointed for the codification of canon law, as well as of the eminent Cardinals chosen on this special commission for the preparation of the new code, by whom, as well as by the S. Congregation of the Council, frequent meetings have been held for this purpose. The opinions of all having been taken, His Holiness ordered the Sacred Congregation of the Council to issue a decree containing the laws, approved by himself on sure knowledge and after mature deliberation, by which the discipline regarding sponsalia and marriage is to be regulated for the future and the celebration of them carried out in a sure and orderly manner.

In execution, therefore, of the Apostolic mandate the S. Congregation of the Council by these letters lays down and decrees what follows:

CONCERNING SPONSALIA.

I. Only those are considered valid and produce canonical effects which have been contracted in writing, signed by both the parties and by either the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or at least by two witnesses.

In case one or both the parties be unable to write, this fact is to be noted in the document and another witness is to be added who will sign the writing as above, with the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place or the two witnesses.

II. Here and in the following articles by parish priest is to be understood not only a priest legitimately presiding over a parish canonically erected, but in regions where parishes are not canonically erected the priest to whom the care of souls has been legitimately entrusted in any specified district and who is equivalent to a parish priest; and in missions where the territory has not yet been perfectly divided, every priest generally deputed by the superior of the mission for the care of souls in any station.

CONCERNING MARRIAGE.

III. Only those marriages are valid which are contracted before the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place or a priest delegated by either of these, and at least two witnesses, according to the rules laid down in the following articles, and saving the exceptions mentioned under VII. and VIII.

IV. The parish priest and the Ordinary of the place validly assist at a marriage:

1. Only from the day they have taken possession of the benefice or entered upon their office, unless they have been by a public decree excommunicated by name or suspended from the office.

2. Only within the limits of their territory; within which they assist validly at marriages not only of their own subjects, but also of those not subject to them.

3. Provided when invited and asked, and not compelled by violence or by grave fear, they demand and receive the consent of the contracting parties.

V. They assist licitly:

1. When they have legitimately ascertained the free state of the contracting parties, having duly complied with the conditions laid down by the law.

2. When they have ascertained that one of the contracting parties has a domicile or at least has lived for a month in the place where the marriage takes place.

3. If this condition be lacking the parish priest and the Ordinary of the place, to assist licitly at a marriage, require the permission of the parish priest or the Ordinary of one of the contracting parties, unless it be a case of grave necessity, which excuses from this permission.

4. Concerning persons without fixed abode (*vagos*), except in case of necessity it is not lawful for a parish priest to assist at their marriage until they report the matter to the Ordinary or to a priest delegated by him and obtain permission to assist.

5. In every case let it be held as the rule that the marriage is to be celebrated before the parish priest of the bride, unless some just cause excuses from this.

VI. The parish priest and the Ordinary of the place may grant permission to another priest, specified and certain, to assist at marriages within the limits of their district.

The delegated priest, in order to assist validly and licitly, is bound to observe the limits of his mandate and the rules laid down above, in IV. and V., for the parish priest and the Ordinary of the place.

VII. When danger of death is imminent and where the parish

priest or the Ordinary of the place or a priest delegated by either of these cannot be had, in order to provide for the relief of conscience and (should the case require it) for the legitimization of offspring, marriage may be contracted validly and licitly before any priest and two witnesses.

VIII. Should it happen that in any district the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place or a priest delegated by either of them, before whom marriage can be celebrated, is not to be had, and that this condition of things has lasted for a month, marriage may be validly and licitly entered upon by the formal declaration of consent made by the spouses in the presence of two witnesses.

IX. 1. After the celebration of a marriage the parish priest or he who takes his place is to write at once in the book of marriages the names of the couple and of the witnesses, the place and day of the celebration of the marriage and the other details, according to the method prescribed in the ritual books or by the ordinary; and then another priest delegated either by the parish priest or by the ordinary has assisted at the marriage.

2. Moreover, the parish priest is to note also in the book of baptisms that the married person contracted marriage on such a day in his parish. If the married person has been baptized elsewhere the parish priest who has assisted at the marriage is to transmit, either directly or through the episcopal curia, the announcement of the marriage that has taken place, to the parish priest of the place where the person was baptized, in order that the marriage may be inscribed in the book of baptisms.

3. Whenever a marriage is contracted in the manner described in VII. and VIII., the priest in the former case, the witnesses in the latter are bound conjointly with the contracting parties to provide that the marriage be inscribed as soon as possible in the prescribed books.

X. Parish priests who violate the rules thus far laid down are to be punished by their Ordinaries according to the nature and gravity of their transgression. Moreover, if they assist at the marriage of anybody in violation of the rules laid down in 2 and 3 of No. V., they are not to appropriate the stole-fees, but must remit them to the parish priest of the contracting parties.

XI. 1. The above laws are binding on all persons baptized in the Catholic Church and on those who have been converted to it from heresy or schism (even when either the latter or the former have fallen away afterwards from the Church) whenever they contract sponsalia or marriage with one another.

2. The same laws are binding also on the same Catholics as above, if they contract sponsalia or marriage with non-Catholics,

baptized or unbaptized, even after a dispensation has been obtained from the impediment *mixta religionis* or *disparitatis cultus*; unless the Holy See decree otherwise for some particular place or region.

3. Non-Catholics, whether baptized or unbaptized, who contract among themselves are nowhere bound to observe the Catholic form of *sponsalia* or marriage.

The present decree is to be held as legitimately published and promulgated by its transmission to the Ordinaries, and its provisions begin to have the force of law from the solemn feast of the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ, next year, 1908.

Meanwhile, let all the Ordinaries of places see that this decree be made public as soon as possible, and explained in the different parochial churches of their dioceses in order that it may be known by all.

These presents are to have force by the special order of our Most Holy Father Pope Pius X., all things to the contrary, even those worthy of special mention, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome on the 2d day of August in the year 1907.

✠ VINCENT, Card. Bishp. of Palestrina, *Prefect.*

C. DE LAI, *Secretary.*

Book Reviews

THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY. Edited by the Rev. J. W. Wilhelm, Ph. D.

HISTORY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By L'Abbe Jacquien. Vol. I, Epistles of St. Paul. Translated from the French edition by the Rev. James Duggan. 8vo., cloth, gilt top. Price, net, \$2.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is the first volume of a series of books which under the editorship of Rev. J. Wilhelm, Ph. D., is to be published by Messrs. Kegan, Paul & Co. The purpose of the International Library is to make English Catholics acquainted with what is being done by Catholic thinkers on the Continent. It makes a common possession of what might have remained purely local.

In Dr. Wilhelm's introduction to the series he says: "A great number of Catholic scholars of every country are laboring at this task (of making clear to all the real harmony between faith and science). The proximate object of the International Library is to offer to English students and writers the best results of their labors, and a further object is to facilitate between workers in the various fields of ecclesiastical science through the comparison of ideas and ideals a better understanding, an *entente cordiale*, making peace and union."

The book before us is already well known and appreciated in the original. It is familiar to many English students of the Holy Scripture because it has been for some time in use as the text-book of the Southwark Diocesan Seminary. The author thus explains his purpose and plan:

"The book is an attempt to narrate the various circumstances that contributed to the writing of the books of the New Testament with a view to showing in what environment they stand historically and dogmatically. For this purpose we have had to state the events that gave rise to them, we have had to study the philosophical and religious ideas of the authors, and we have had to describe the intellectual and social conditions of those for whom these books were originally intended. We have also had to deal with the question of authenticity, since with regard to most of these books it has been for one reason or another disputed; this discussion will, we hope, be found of practical value in leading the reader towards a thorough knowledge of each book. We have also given an analysis of each book explaining the leading ideas and showing how they are connected one with the other. We have not laid much stress on matters that properly belong to criticism; we have confined ourselves rather to history and dogma."

The author explains his reason for beginning with the history of St. Paul in this paragraph: "We deal with the books in chronological order as far as it can be ascertained. We begin with the Epistles of St. Paul, since their dates are fairly well known to us. In the next place, we take the books according to their probable dates—the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Epistles and the Johannine writings."

The author's characteristics are excellency of arrangement, keenness of analytical power, liberality in quoting and clearness of style. He presents a very interesting subject in a very attractive manner.

TEN LECTURES ON THE MARTYRS. By *Paul Allard*. With a preface by Mgr. Pechenard, rector of the Catholic University of Paris. Authorized translation by Luigi Cappadelta. 8vo., cloth, gilt top. Price, \$2.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The translator of this book has had the unusual advantage of having had his translation read and approved by the author, who made several valuable suggestions. The book contains ten lectures, which were delivered by M. Paul Allard at the Catholic University of Paris. They attracted large audiences, who followed them with rapt attention. Their excellence was at once recognized, and the demand for their publication soon became general. The author was already well known by his previous works as one who stood in the first rank of our contemporary apologists. His work on the persecutions attracted the attention not only of Catholics, but even of the opponents of the true faith. They have acknowledged his high qualities, breadth of his scholarship, the sureness of his criticism, the strength of his methods, the moderation of his conclusions and the courtesy which has never failed him in dealing with an adversary.

The purpose of the lectures may be stated in a few words: They show forth under its many aspects a great fact of history—the violent death of an innumerable multitude of Christians of every age and sex, and country, and condition, who have willingly given testimony to Christ, to His life and death and resurrection and to the truth of His doctrine, and who preferred to lose their lives rather than be false to their religious convictions.

This task has been admirably performed. The writer has shown with all the amplitude which such a subject demands, the motives which occasioned the testimony, the situation in which it was given, the number of those who gave it, the proceedings taken against them, the tortures and sufferings which they endured, the impression made by their testimony on the minds of contemporaries, the honors bestowed on their relics and the inferences which we are entitled to draw from all this. It is a beautiful subject and one which appeals

to every man in whom the higher qualities are developed even in an imperfect degree. As one reads these lectures he finds his heart glowing within him, as the hearts of the disciples on the way to Emaus glowed, while the Saviour explained to them the prophesies of the Old Testament which proved His Divinity. To the old law have been added these witnesses of the new, and combining they make Christianity irresistible.

THE BLIND SISTERS OF ST. PAUL. By *Maurice De La Sizeranne*. Authorized translation by L. M. Leggatt. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1907.

The reputation of the author, himself totally blind since 1866, and his constant and successful labors for the amelioration and elevation of his afflicted brethren, entitle him to a hearing irrespective of his merits in the present undertaking. But a hearing will beget interest, admiration, approbation.

"The hitherto practically unknown community of the Blind Sisters of St. Paul deserves wider fame. It is sufficiently attractive to study the religious congregations of our time from a psychological and social point of view, since we can thus analyze and classify many needs of the present day, the spirit of self-sacrifice and those forms of physical or moral indigence differing so widely from those which a gift can relieve. But is not a still keener interest aroused when it is a question of nuns whose blindness places them under such special conditions? In this community all the Sisters are not blind or threatened with blindness; there are many nuns with perfect eyesight; still the name of "Blind Sisters of St. Paul" was given to the congregation to emphasize the fact that it was founded for the blind and is their true home. Before penetrating into the convent or describing the origin, the charitable aims or the future of the congregation, it seems indispensable—though we must not overlook the problem of the blind girl's vocation or the type of abnegation which leads a woman with eyesight to live in the midst of the blind—to speak even at great length of blindness in woman. It is necessary to analyze the impressions she receives from things and from people, and to discuss what her place in a home can be. Can she be useful or active? Can she love and be loved? Finally, what is to be her physical or mental share of life? These questions, though preliminary, nevertheless demand wide development, given the fact of how little we realize the real physical and moral condition of the blind. In the first part of this book, therefore, I have endeavored to portray the sensations of blind women, how they feel, live and act; I have quoted as much as possible from their own words, to give a sincere test of their impressions. I have also quoted largely from writers who appear unconsciously to have recorded purely tactile

and oral impressions, so as to show that 'contact of the blind with nature' is not chimerical, since these perceptions and sensations which I claim for them have been felt and expressed by certain well-known and appreciated writers. It is, therefore, quite intentionally that I have multiplied quotations in this book, in spite of the disadvantages of such a method. I would add that it is always a pleasure to come across pages of charming writings, and if these extracts induce the reader to finish the book, he cannot blame me. Such is this modest work, and in spite of its want of cohesion, not to mention other defects, it seemed to me that this subject might interest philanthropists and students of psychology."

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE. By *Leon De La Briere*. Authorized translation by Meta and Mary Brown. With illustrations. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

This is an intensely interesting book. Any one who reads it, and follows the King's daughter from the glare of the palace into the shadow of the cell of the Carmelite nun, there to offer her prayers and mortifications for the conversion of her worldly, sinful father, will be deeply touched and edified. In the visits of the father to his child we catch a glimpse of his better side and the beginning of the working of the grace of God. Do we not see the value of the sacrifice of the Princess in the dismissal of the mistress and the penitent death of the sovereign, a victim of small-pox? It is a strong sidelight on history.

"We have many books which paint for us the dark side of the reign of Louis XV.; and indeed the dark side is only too painfully apparent. The splendors of the reign of Louis XIV. had hidden the canker that was eating into the heart of French society. When, however, the 'grand monarque' had passed away and the regency fell into the hands of the profligate Duc d'Orleans, all veils of exterior decency were cast aside and the court of France became a scandal to the world. For a short time after reaching his majority the young King endeavored to fulfill the duties of his high office. Unfortunately the effort did not last long, and soon Louis sank even deeper than his predecessor into the depths of vice and ignominy. France and her people were forgotten, whilst her King drowned all sense of duty in the whirl of his vile pleasures.

"Such is the picture history has handed down to us of the court of Louis XV.

"Yet in the midst of this heartless, Godless frivolity, in the very Palace of Versailles, was a little group who lived untainted by a single breath of the corruption around them. This group consisted of the neglected Queen, Marie Leczinska, and her daughters.

"This little book, which we have translated for English readers,

tells the life story of one of these daughters, and gives a glimpse of this tiny court within a court, where history had not time to linger. It throws a curious light on the private life of Louis XV., and perhaps some will be surprised to see flashes of virtue which might have made Louis a great and good man.

"We may remark as a characteristic of French life, and no doubt the life of other Southern Catholic countries, that even where the practice of faith is altogether neglected, and faith itself seems hardly existent, there is yet an undercurrent which at supreme moments will come to the surface. Centuries have rooted the faith so deeply that it is in their very blood."

THE GODDESS OF REASON. A Drama in Five Acts. By *Mary Johnston*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1907. Pp. 234. Price, \$2.00, net; postage, 15 cents.

The drama is a tragedy and deals with the period of the French Revolution. The plot, whose main characteristics can be surmised fairly well from the incidents of the First Act, is interesting nevertheless, and affords opportunity for a number of striking scenes and incidents which occasionally produce complications attaining to dramatic climaxes. The hero is De Vardes, newly succeeded to the baronage of Morbec, in Brittany. The time is the summer of 1791; and Act I. presents us with the capture of some neighboring peasants who had unsuccessfully attacked the château of Morbec. In repelling the feeble attack De Vardes recalled in Yvette, the peasant girl who led it, the memory of a certain beautiful Diana whom he had come across in the dreamy wood of Paimpont—a vision which had fled his approach all too hastily for his happiness. At her intercession he now pardons the peasants, and soon discovers himself deeply in love with Yvette. But Yvette, in the progress of the story, is also loved by the Deputy Lalain, in boyhood as closely knit in bonds of affection to De Vardes as David had been to Jonathan, but now a most active anti-aristocrat. Yvette, although a hot Republican in her sympathies, in secret loves De Vardes, but thinks him in love with the Marquise de Blanchefôret. The Revolution progresses to the Terror, in which Yvette becomes "the Goddess of Reason" worshiped by the mob in Nantes. Thither happens De Vardes, now proscribed by the Revolution. The love plot becomes tangled through the jealous misapprehensions of Yvette and the revulsion of feeling experienced by De Vardes at seeing her worshiped as "the Goddess." Finally De Vardes is captured and condemned to death, whereupon Yvette cries out from the gallery of the judgment hall: "I denounce the Republic!" is herself condemned

and, thus finally united with De Vardes in a mutual love freed from all misunderstanding, is cast with him into the watery grave of the Loire.

Our first criticism has to deal with the plot, in which we find, on two occasions, the hero performing feats of valor so far beyond the probabilities of the case as to remind us forcibly that Mary Johnston is the author of the successful novel "To Have and to Hold." In that novel, if our memory plays us not false, the hero, after an exhausting experience of toil and wreck, and after a fast of two days' duration, encounters in succession several pirates, who, although expert swordsmen, are defeated by him in single combat in one-two-three order. It is only a woman's hero who could achieve such feats, which deserve to rank beside those of the gallant Falstaff. In the present drama De Vardes repulses the peasants' attack almost single-handed and with only a sword for a weapon:

The maenad with a sickle he puts by;
Runs through the arm a clamourer of *corvée*,
Brings howling to his knees a *sans-culotte*,
And strikes a flail from out a claw-like hand!

We naturally wonder what the twenty or thirty peasants were doing during this display of swordsmanship. Again, hard pressed at Nantes by "seven or eight red-capped men armed with pikes," he and his friend De Buc, with naught but swords, deal wondrous blows of death. What were the men with the pikes a-doing meanwhile?

An extremely unpleasant feature of the plot is the fact that Yvette, knowing herself and known as the illegitimate child of De Vardes' father, is nevertheless loved by De Vardes—a more repulsive situation than that which has given to "Tristan and Isolde" an unpleasant notoriety. Also, while it may add something to the vividness of the atmosphere of the play, every reader must regret that a woman should place on the page the song assigned to "A Woman's Voice" (pp. 222-3), or should repeat so often the phrase applied to Yvette, "the Right of the Seigneur," or should also repeat that other, "Baiser des mariées" (as a privilege of the seigneur), or place on Seraphine's lips the taunt addressed to Yvette, "kept by an aristocrat;" or, even as referred to the Du Barry, the words of "The Woman" (p. 109): "Ho! ho! The courtesan, she'll kiss no more!" Doubtless it is quite old-fashioned, in this day of female daring in current literature, to object to such expressions in a play written by a woman, or to the song we have referred to. But we shall have many sympathizers, we doubt not, in our protest.

The characterization in the drama is, in some respects, unfortunate. The object of the author is to portray types, not exceptions. But the conduct of the noblesse in the prison at Nantes, which is

doubtless intended to illustrate the high spirit and courage of the noblesse, does in fact suggest rather bravado than bravery; and the portraiture of the abbé in the First Act is not that of a prevalent type. Many abbés were doubtless courtiers, and some, perhaps, gallants; but our abbé is the only one introduced into the drama, and he should have been either omitted (his presence does not in the slightest way affect the course of the action, and he is introduced merely as part of the atmosphere of the drama) or he should represent the prevalent type of abbé.

Finally, the blank verse might, we fancy, receive much attention from the file, at least in the first half of the drama. As an illustration both of uncertain metre and of the poetic character of the author's muse, the following may serve (p. 31):

I rode from Morbec here to Chantillon,
And through the wood of Paimpont fared alone.
It is a forest where enchantments thrive,
And a fair dream doth drop from every tree!
The old, old world of bitterness and strife
Is remote as winter, remote as death.
It was high noon in the turbulent town;
But clocks never strike in the elfin wood,
And the sun's ruddy gold is elsewhere spent.
The light was dim in the depths of Paimpont,
Green, reverend, and dim as the light may be
In a sea king's palace under the sea.
The wind did not blow; the flowering bough
Was still as the rose on a dead man's breast.
On velvet hoof the doe and fawn went by;
In other woods the lark and linnet sang;
A stealthy way was taken by the fox;
The badger trod upon the softest moss;
And like a shadow flitted past the hare.
Without a sound the haunted fountain played.
The oak boughs dreamed; the pine was motionless;
Its silver arms the beech in silence spread;
The poplar had forgot its lullaby.

The occasional lyrics are happily conceived and expressed (bar-ring, always, the one to which objection has been already taken).

DE SACRAMENTO EXTREMAE UNCTIONIS TRACTATUS DOGMATICUS auctore
Joseph Kern, S. J. Ratisbonæ et Neo-Eboraci (New York): Pustet &
Co., 1907. Pp. 412, price 4 marks.

It may seem an exaggeration to say that the present dogmatic treatise on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction—from the hand it may be mentioned, by the way, of a professor of theology at the University of Innsbruck—contains some opinions which are likely to appear new, even at this late time, to the average student of divinity. The author anticipates as much when he says that not only laymen but priests as well wonder when they hear it defended that Christ instituted the Sacrament of Extreme Unction as a preservation from the pains of Purgatory and a means of immediate entrance

to heaven. Indeed, the author admits that he himself was astonished (*se quoque obstupuisse*) when studying the great doctors of the thirteenth century he found that they place the proximate purpose of that sacrament to be the disposal of the soul for the attainment of bliss immediately after death—*ad continuum consecutionem beatitudinis*. There can be no doubt, as the author likewise suggests, that if this doctrine is proven to be true, it must have great efficacy towards increasing reverence for the sacrament, in preventing that foolish dread which causes so many when seriously ill to neglect the divine medicine, and in arousing serious effort on the part of recipients in order to obtain the full fruit of the sacred anointing. If, then, the present treatise did nothing else but establish, or rather bring out into stronger light, so salutary a teaching—and we think the author's arguments certainly do all this—it would have made good its claim on the attention of theological students. It does much more than this, however. It not only develops more thoroughly the arguments vindicating the sacramental essence of Extreme Unction than is usually done in similar treatises—it does this, by the way, by a fuller treatment of the Oriental traditions—but it puts forward a plea for the repetition of the sacrament *in eodem mortis pinculo*. This plea the author recognizes is unlikely to be easily admitted by his fellow-theologians—*sententiae quae videntur esse novae, suspicioni dant locum*. Nevertheless, he claims that no speculative grounds can be made good against the opinion defending said reiteration. Since, then, the Church has made no pronouncement thereon, and since abstract argumentation does not confute the opinion, the only refutation available would have to be drawn from history. On the other hand, Father Kern expresses his confidence that *tantum abesse ut accuratior inquisitio in fontes historicos eam evertat, ut eam sit magis magisque confirmatura*. The verdict of justification of this assertion we leave to the consideration of expert theologians, confident that whatever be their decision on this point, their judgment will pronounce for the solidity, thoroughness and lucidity of the work as a whole. Surely the intelligent student cannot come from the perusal of the book without a deeper persuasion of the copious redemption conveyed by Christ to sick souls and bodies through the sacred anointments.

MEDITATIONS ON CHRISTIAN DOGMA. By *Right Rev. James Bellord, D. D.* With an introductory letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Third edition. Two vols., 12mo., pp. 369 and 363. Convent of Mercy, Callan, County Kilkenny.

Since Dr. Bellord's book first appeared it has grown in favor as it has become better known, until now it has reached a third edition.

It has been accepted strictly on its merits, and it needs no other commendation. It is founded on "La Théologie Affective," by Louis Bail, of Abbeville. The original first appeared in 1638, and was republished several times, but always in folio until 1845, when, after revision and amendment, it was brought out in five octavo volumes of about five hundred pages each.

The value of the work was never questioned, but it was too diffuse to be of practical service, and it was inaccessible to English readers generally because it was published in the French tongue only. Dr. Bellord's first thought was to condense the original book, but he soon found that it would be necessary to write a practically new book. He took the framework or skeleton of the present work from "Théologie Affective," keeping in the main to the order of the treatises and the division into meditations, but beyond that he allowed himself the widest latitude.

The characteristics of the book are that it takes in regular order every one of the treatises contained in the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas; that it divides them conveniently into portions, each complete in itself; that it presents these as meditations, with fitting applications and affections, and that by these means it changes an abstract and technical study into a devotional and practical exercise.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

STIMULUS DIVINI AMORIS. That is, The Goad of Divine Love. Very proper and profitable for all devout persons to read. Written in Latin by the Seraphical doctor *S. Bonaventure*, of the Seraphical order of St. Francis. Englished by B. Lewis A., of the same order. At Doway by the widow of Mary Wyon, Permission Superiorum 1642. Revised and edited by W. A. Phillipson, priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster. R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., London and Glasgow; Benziger Brothers, New York. (All rights reserved.)

FOLIA FUGITIVA. Leaves from the Log-Book of St. Erconwald's Deanery, Essex. Edited by the Rev. W. H. Cologan, honorary secretary of the Catholic Truth Society. 12mo., pp. 420. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1907.

CONTEMPLATIVE PRAYER. Venerable Father Augustine Baker's Teachings Thereon, from "Sancta Sophia." By *Dom. B. Weld-Blundell*, monk of the order of St. Benedict. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1907.

HISTORY OF IRELAND FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. By *Rev. E. A. d'Alton, M. R. I. A.* In three volumes. 8vo. Vol. II. From 1547 to 1782. PP. xv.+576. New York: Benziger Brothers.

SERMONS. By the *Rev. Dr. Moriarty*, late Bishop of Kerry. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1907.

70765

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

